



# RAY-BURNETT DEBATE

A DISCUSSION

OF THE

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES

OF THE

MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH



CINCINNATI

STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

1884



## PREFACE.

---

The matter in this book is the result of a newspaper discussion won between the AMERICAN BAPTIST FLAG and the CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, on the doctrines and practices of the Missionary Baptist church. It needs no explanation. Every word uttered in the debate is contained in the book. It is thought by many that good will result, if it is given to the world in the form of a book.

THOS. R. BURNETT.

BONHAM, TEXAS, June 20, 1884.



# RAY-BURNETT DEBATE.

---

[Baptist Flag.]

QUESTIONS TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

If the so-called Christian Campbellite church had an existence, local habitation or a name, prior to the days of these Campbells, let the Christian Messenger answer the following questions:

1. Was there a church organization, such as the editor of the Messenger now holds membership in, on earth one hundred years ago?

2. If so, where was it located?

3. Who was its pastor?

4. By what name was it known?

If the Messenger fails to answer, we will take it for granted that the editor knows he belongs to a church which had its origin with the Campbells.

[Christian Messenger.]

The Messenger rarely fails to answer any fair question. But the Baptist papers usually fail to publish our answers in their columns. We shall see whether Dr. Ray maintains this custom of "Baptist usage." First, we do not know any so-called Christian Campbellite church on the earth. If the editor of the American Baptist Flag knows such, he should have addressed his questions to one of its editors. There was a church "such as the editor of the Messenger holds membership in" some eighteen hundred years ago, and it maintained its integrity and purity for along while. By and by it degenerated and apostatized and went into the wilderness of human tradition. In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name "Baptist church," a name unknown to the Scriptures, had a human creed, was using the mourning-bench machinery of the Methodists, and was requiring the relation of an "experience" as a qualification for baptism, instead of a confession of faith in Christ. Campbell and his co-laborers called on the church to reform—abandon its departures, lay aside its human name and human creed and come back to the Bible, and purge itself of all these innovations and traditions. A large portion of the body listened to the words of the reformer, and is to-day stand-

ing upon the ancient landmarks. A portion of it is still in the wilderness, holding on to it's human name and human creed with a death-grip, while the editors in that part of Babylon are bitter in their denunciation of all who express a desire or determination to return to the Bible. We trust Mr. Ray's questions have been answered. And now if the Flag fails to publish this answer, it will be taken for granted that the editor knows he belongs to a church in the wilderness, and one that wears an unscriptural name, and that his readers know that he knows he belongs to such a church.

[Baptist Flag.]

Having returned from a field tour, we found the so-called answer of the so-called Christian Messenger, in which it dodges the question. Passing over the ignorance of the editor, in not knowing of the existence of the so-called "Christian Campbellite church," we remark as follows: First: Mr. Burnett admits in this dodge that there was not a true church organization on earth one hundred years ago! That God had no true witnesses! That there was not so much as one Christian church on earth one hundred years ago!! Mr. Burnett thinks that the true church of Christ 'degenerated or apostatized,' and became a part of Babylon, without the Bible! The editor of the Messenger did not refer to the Scriptures to sustain his false accusation against Jesus Christ and his church. We suppose that he knows that the Bible does not sustain his abominable charges. Jesus built his church upon the Rock of Ages, and said that "the gates *of* hell shall not prevail against it." The angel Gabriel said of Jesus, "He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Also Jesus says of his church, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Even when the church, symbolized by the sun-clothed woman, flew on eagle wings from the dragon into the wilderness, it was to her "place prepared of God that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three score days" from the face of the serpent. Rev. 12th chap. Did God prepare apostasy and Babylon for his church? Oh, hush! We say to this so-called Christian editor: "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." Second: Mr. Burnett, in his pretended answer, claimed that Alex. Campbell called on the churches of the "apostasy" and "Babylon" to reform, "come back to the Bible and purge itself of all these innovations and traditions," and that those that obeyed the voice of the reformer are to-day standing upon the ancient landmarks. If these things

be true, Alex. Campbell has superceded Jesus Christ in the kingdom of God. For according to Mr. Burnett, the church of Christ apostatized and became a corrupt part of spiritual Babylon, but Mr. Alex. Campbell, the great, raised this *fallen apostate Babylon*, which Christ was not able to sustain, from her corruptions, so that she has become the Christian church! According to this Campbellite blasphemy, the church established by Jesus Christ apostatized and became a part of Babylon, but the great reformer reformed this apostate ecclesiastical harlot Babylon to prepare a bride for Jesus Christ!! Therefore, according to Campbellism, Jesus the bridegroom must be married to a reformed ecclesiastical harlot!!! Third: In his so-called answer, Mr. Burnett, the editor of the Christian Messenger, a Campbellite paper, was forced to confess in his issue of August 9, 1882, that the church of Jesus Christ, of the apostolic age, had continued to exist and was called the "Baptist church" in the days of Alex. Campbell. In his Messenger, some years ago, the same Mr. T. H. Burnett was forced to make the same 'good confession,' as follows: "With Alex. Campbell, we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his coadjutors started the reformation, and (they) are yet a part of that kingdom, though entangled in some errors." Mr. A. Campbell, in his McCalla debate, page 378, says, "From the apostolic age to the present time the sentiments of the Baptists, and their practice of baptism, have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every age can be produced." As the kingdom of God has been with the Baptists "from the apostolic age to the present time," and as "the kingdom shall not be left to other people," it is evident that the kingdom has been with the Baptists "from the days of John the Baptist until now." Fourth: As Mr. Burnett failed to furnish the proofs, his false charges against Baptists need no attention. However, we invite him to the division of space in our respective papers, to the amount of one column per week, for the discussion of the respective church claims of Baptists and disciples. What will he say? As the Campbellite papers usually fail to publish our answers in their columns, we will see whether Mr. Burnett maintains this custom of Campbellite usage. Now, if the Messenger fails to publish this answer, it will be taken for granted that the editor knows that he belongs to a church which has A. Campbell for its founder and head.

[Christian Messenger.]

The Messenger is not desirous to maintain any custom of Campbellite usage, as it is not a Campbellite paper, hence it

usually publishes Baptist answers, when Baptist writers can be induced to furnish answers. We devote considerable space to the cranky effusions of D. B. Ray, which that cranky individual knows to his sorrow. We presume the doctor has been asleep for the past two years, that he has overlooked the discussions that have been going on in these columns during that time, with our broad challenge to the Baptist clergy of the United States to find the name 'Baptist church' in history for the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian era, with offer of space in the Christian Messenger to publish the same when found. Dr. Ray has been as dumb as an Egyptian mummy in presence of that proposition for two years. Now he seems to have "experienced" a sudden influx of Baptist virtue, or a sudden rush of stiffness to the spinal column, that he awakes to the necessity of a "division of space" on the church question. The doctor can not have forgotten that two or three years ago he was tendered all the space he desired in this paper to discuss the differences of Baptists and Christians, and he prudently declined. For more than twelve months we have had a proposition before the Baptist preachers and editors of Texas, which they have not accepted. Mr. Ray can now have a "division of space" on the same proposition. It reads as follows:

"The Missionary Baptist church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church." Ray affirms.

But the doctor says we are ignorant, in that we do not know of the existence of a "Christian Campbellite church." We give Mr. Ray credit for being much wiser than ourself in regard to things that do not exist. He imagines that there is a Baptist church in the Bible, and we are very sure no mortal man ever read about such a thing in the sacred Book. He imagines there is a Baptist succession from D. B. Ray to the apostle Peter, but all sane men know that they might as well try to trace the track of a mosquito through a continent of fog as to trace such a line. He also imagines that there is a mourning-bench, and a "experience of grace" as a qualification for baptism, in the Bible, while every man who has read the Bible with his eyes open knows they are the chimeras of a crippled brain. The "Campbellite church" is a chimera—a ghost, a goblin, to frighten silly doctors of divinity that ought to be shut up in the lunatic asylum.

But Mr. Ray says that Mr. Burnett admits that there was not a church of Christ on earth, and no true witnesses, one hundred years ago. Mr. Burnett admits no such thing. He said the true church, of which the Baptists constituted a part, had apostatized to some extent, and that it was in this condition when

Mr. Campbell began to preach reform. There were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses today, in the Baptist church—Christians—and they are only kept in Babylon, shut up in their close-communication party pen and made to endure the stigma of an unscriptural name and human creed by force of the party whip and ignorance of true gospel reform. Thousands of them every year are breaking away from party restraints and coming to the Bible. If Mr. Ray does not believe that the true church of Christ can apostatize, he does not believe the Bible—that is all. He ought to read the book of Revelation, and the letters to the seven churches, and Paul's writings about the apostasy. The ante-type, Israel, on account of a departure from God's law, were carried into Babylon, and afterward a part of them returned to Canaan. But they did not cease to be God's chosen people while in Babylon, and there was no break in the national church. If we had not a word of Scripture to prove the apostasy of the church, and it were admitted that the Baptists were a part of that church, the proof could be furnished without trouble. And this we have done time and again. Do they not to-day wear an unscriptural name, have a human creed, use the anxious-seat, relate experiences, confess feelings instead of faith, teach a direct operation of the Spirit, deny that the gospel is the power unto salvation, teach that faith comes by praying and not by hearing, and many other things contrary to the apostolic doctrine and practice? Is not this an apostasy? If the Baptists have ever been a part of the kingdom of God, they are off the ancient landmarks to-day. And while they may not be as far down in Babylon as the pope, still every departure from apostolic doctrine is a step away from Jerusalem. Dr. Ray's quotation of texts to prove the perpetuity of Christ's kingdom is a gratuity. We have never taught nor believed differently. A man with half an eye can see a difference between the affirmation that the church of Christ departed from the faith and that it failed altogether. We believe the statement that Christ founded his church upon the rock, and that it has been there ever since. But Christ nowhere said, "Upon this rock I will build the Baptist church." It did not exist in the world for fifteen hundred years after he left the earth. Dr. Ray can not find the name Baptist church in the world till the sixteenth century. Men organized the Baptist church out of a faction of the church of Christ in England in the sixteenth century. Dr. Ray can not get his line any nearer the apostles than this. He can not trace through the Waldenses, for they were not Baptists, and they did not call themselves Baptists. He can not find the name Baptist church in all the Waldensian writings.

Fox's Book of Martyrs contains not one single Baptist martyr, from the death of Stephen to the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Dr. Ray ought to read this book. If he knows anything about history, he knows there was not a Baptist church on earth from pentecost to the end of the fifteenth century.

But, says Mr. Ray, the position that the church apostatized assumes that the bride of Christ has been living in ecclesiastical adultery! And he wants us to repent of the wickedness of such a charge, and calls it "Campbellite blasphemy," and puts in numerous exclamation points!! If it is blasphemy to talk about the adultery, it is a great deal worse to commit it. And what else is the Baptist church doing to-day but living in open ecclesiastical adultery with the servant John? She prefers to wear his name to that of the bridegroom, and dates her married life from the banks of the Jordan! More than this, she persistently refuses to correct the amours when pointed out to her and her keepers multiply maledictions and misrepresentations upon the head of every reformer who calls upon her to break off the adulterous connection and in future submit herself to the true husband, and wear his name alone! Here is a place for your exclamation points, Dr. Ray. And here is a place for repentance, if you have not grown so hard that it is impossible to renew you to repentance! Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the sin of entangling the bride of Christ in an unholy alliance with one of the servants may be forgiven thee! The pity for Mr. Ray, and his co-defenders of Baptist traditions, is, that they see no adultery in this unholy connection, and no Babylon in it, and hold up their hands in sanctified horror when they are charged with it! They are so much like the pope of Rome. He does not think that he is in Babylon, or that the true church of Christ can apostatize.

But Mr. Ray thinks that the editor of the Messenger and Mr. Alex. Campbell made the "good confession" that the Baptists were a part of the kingdom of Christ. Yes. Mr. Campbell made his confession while he was a Baptist preacher, in the McCalla debate, and the editor of the Messenger made his to the effect that the Baptist church is that part of the kingdom that is in Babylon, and he is always "confessing" that it ought to heed the warning of Revelation, "Come out of her my people." Neither Mr. Campbell nor the editor of the Messenger said that the Baptist church had continued from the days of the apostles, for neither one of them was that ignorant. If Mr. Ray will find the name 'Baptist church' in history during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era, or find a Baptist creed in the world during that time, we will raise him fifty cash sub-

scribers for his paper. If he can not do this—and we know he can not—we demand that he shall make the "good confession" that he belongs to a church that is not in the Bible, and was not in the world for fifteen hundred years after Christ, and that he (Ray) will "repent of this his wickedness" in calling the church of Christ the "Campbellite church," and will never say again that Alex. Campbell is its head and founder.

If Mr. Ray does not depart from "Baptist usage" far enough to give this a place in his columns, we will take it as a "good confession" that he is afraid to let his readers hear the truth on this question.

[Baptist Flag.]

If we have sinned against the Messenger in failing to use its columns for the discussion of the claims of Baptists and disciples, we propose now to pay the debt, with interest. In the introductory questions and answers, the question of the origin of the two denominations has been introduced. As Baptists are *first* in doctrine and history, this origin properly stands first.

BAPTIST CHURCHES HAVE THEIR ORIGIN WITH CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

The leading objection urged by the Messenger to this proposition is that the name "Baptist church" is not found in the Bible, nor in history till the sixteenth century! If this is true, it does not bear one feather against our apostolic origin, provided it can be established that the church now called the Baptist church, is the true apostolic church, which originated more than 1800 years ago. This historic fact has already been admitted by the Messenger. For in its answers to our standing questions the Messenger confessed "that Christ founded His church upon the Rock, and that it has been there ever since." Of this same church, the Messenger says: "In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore according to the Christian Messenger, the church formed by Christ, which has continued to the present time, was called the *Baptist church*, in the days of Alexander Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the Messenger was forced to say:

"With Alexander Campbell, we say that the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his coadjutors started the reformation."

Now, according to the good confession of the Christian Messenger, the church which was founded by Christ, and which continued on the rock till the present time, was wearing the name 'Baptist church,' in the days of Alexander Campbell; and that the kingdom of God was with the Baptists before Mr.

Campbell started the reformation of the nineteenth century. This is "a noble confession." We have now proved, by the Christian Messenger itself, that the church, now called the Baptist church, had its origin with Jesus Christ. Mr. Campbell bore the same testimony in his debate with McCalla, where he says:

"From the apostolic age to the present time the sentiments of the Baptists, and their practice of baptism, have had a continual chain of advocates and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced." p. 378.

This is the emphatic testimony of Mr. Campbell to the claim of Baptist succession and existence in every century, from the apostolic age to the present time; whether it was called the "Baptist church" all the time does not affect the identity as to apostolic origin. For example, the Campbellite society has assumed the name "Christian church," but they have been forced to admit that this name is not in the Bible. Mr. Campbell was better informed than to contend that the identity of the church depends upon its being called by any one name. In his debate with Bishop Purcell, p. 77, he says:

"Every sect and individual, as I said before, is passive in receiving a name. Sectarian names are generally given in the way of reproach; thus, the disciples were first allied Christians at Antioch, most probably in derision; yet it was a very proper name. Call us what you please, however, it does not change nature or race. The disciples of Christ are the same race, call them Christians, Nazarenes, Galileans, Novatians, Donatists, Paulicans, Waldenses, Albigenses, Protestants, or what you please. A variety of designations affects not the facts which we allege; we can find an unbroken series of Protestants—a regular succession of those who protested against the corruptions of the Roman church, and endeavored to hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, from the first schism in the year 250 A. D. to the present day; and you may apply to them what description or designation you please."

The Christian Messenger has really admitted the same thing where it contends that the Baptists constitute "a part of the true church." The Messenger admits that there were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to-day, in the Baptist church—Christians. Now, if Baptists are true witnesses for Christ, and Christians, then it follows that they are true churches of Christ.

It seems that our questions and criticisms have thrown the Messenger into religious fits. That it is cranky at times is evident from the following: 1. The Messenger admits that Baptists are true witnesses for Christ—true Christians; and yet, in the same article, speaks of a discussion of "the differences of

Baptists and Christians." Of course, the Messenger is cranky. 2. After all the good and true things which the Messenger has said about the Baptists, it falls into a cranky fit, and says, that "the Baptist church is living in open ecclesiastical adultery"!!! We do not say that the editor should be shut up in the lunatic asylum, but his friends will do well to keep an eye upon him, to prevent him from injuring himself.

The cranky notion that the Babylon harlot is to be *reformed*, to prepare a bride for Jesus Christ, is too bad! On the contrary, the Babylonish harlot of Revelation is to be destroyed, and her body given to the burning flame. See Rev. 18th and 19th chapters. When the "undefiled fair one"—the true church—the bride of Jesus Christ is exalted, the apostate Babylon will be cast into the lake of fire, and the smoke of her torment will rise up "forever and forever."

The true church did not fall away—apostatize. It was the false Christians that fell *away* from the church. While there are some of God's people in Babylon, the true church did not go into Babylon. Some of the sheep are not in the true fold. It is their duty to come out of Babylon. In spite of all the deadly heresy of Campbellism, there are some of God's people in that human society. When these people come out, as they are constantly doing, it is not the church coming out of Campbellism, but those unfortunate stray sheep coming to the true fold.

## II. THE DISCIPLES HAD THEIR ORIGIN WITH ALEX. CAMPBELL AND HIS COADJUTORS.

One hundred years ago there was no church in the world such as disciples now call the *Christian* church. At that time there was not even one man, woman or child holding the peculiarities of the disciples of the nineteenth century. That the disciples had their origin with Alex. Campbell in the present century is proved from the following testimony:

First: Mr. Burnett, a leading Campbellite, in the Living Pulpit, p. 47, speaking of the church of the disciples, says:

" Within the last forty-five years, a community has grown from zero to half a million."

This is the confession that the community known as the disciples came from *nothing* within forty-five years from the date of the publication of the book called the "Living Pulpit." It has now been something over fifty years since the Campbellite church started from zero.

Second: Mr. Moore, editor of the Living Pulpit, a leading work of the disciples, page 14, says:

"This was the beginning of the great, reformatory movement, known as the Reformation of the nineteenth century."

And speaking of these labors of Mr. Campbell and others the same writer says:

"Under the influence of these movements, which had no well-defined organization, a latent force was excited, which has taken the body and form of what is now known as the Christian church, or disciples of Christ."

Mark the fact that from the latent force excited by Mr. Campbell and others has come the so-called Christian church or disciples of Christ. It came from zero—from nothing—something more than fifty years ago.

Third: In the year 1847 Mr. A. Campbell went to Europe and in a letter of introduction which he bore from Henry Clay, we have the statement as follows:

"Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States."

See Memoirs, of A. Campbell by Prof. Richardson, vol. 2, p. 558. Bead it again. Mr. Campbell by using this document, endorsed and published the fact that he himself was THE HEAD AND FOUNDER of the religious community called the "Christian church or disciples of Christ"!!! Yes, just as certain as John Wesley was the head and founder of the Methodist church, so was Alexander Campbell the head and founder of this modern so-called Christian church. It is really pitiful to witness the miserable tricks of some of the deceitful disciples in trying to dodge the notorious fact that they are compelled to look to Alexander Campbell as their ecclesiastical father.

Fourth: Mr. Charles V. Segar, a leading Campbellite, in his life of Alexander Campbell, which stands endorsed by the disciples, page 25, says:

"Alexander Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the recognized head of a new religious movement, the purpose of which was to restore primitive Christianity in all its simplicity and beauty. Out of this movement has grown a people, who choose to call themselves Christians or disciples, now numbering not less than five hundred thousand members in the United States."

Mr. Segar was not so ignorant or dishonest as to deny that Alex. Campbell was the *recognized head* of the new religious movement which brought into existence the church of the disciples. In view of the foregoing facts Mr. T. R. Burnett of the Christian Messenger ought to confess his sins and repent of

his wickedness in denying that Alexander Campbell was the head and founder of the so-called Christian church with which he stands identified. When this appears in the Christian Messenger we will proceed in our next to examine the doctrinal claims of Baptists and Disciples.

[Christian Messenger.]

There is only one point in the Flag's reply that deserves serious notice, and that is the statement that we admit that in the days of Alex. Campbell the kingdom of Christ, or a part of the kingdom, was wearing the name 'Baptist church,' and hence the Baptist church must have been the church that was built upon the rock. The conclusion by no means follows. The church that was built upon the rock was the church of Christ—"MY church." All the distinctive features of the Baptist church, that constituted it the Baptist church, were added afterward—were innovations. Not one of them existed in the days of the apostles. If a portion of the followers of Christ—a part of his kingdom—apostatized from the faith, laid aside his name and took the name of a servant, made them a human creed, and constituted a sect called the Baptist church, it by no means follows that Christ is the author or founder of this sect. Everything in it of a Christian character came from Christ, and was in the original church; everything that is Baptist came from men, and is of modern origin. Shorn of these peculiarities, it would remain a church of Christ simply, but would no longer be the Baptist church. Will Mr. Ray please tell us what constitutes a Baptist church? Can a church be a Baptist church and not wear the name Baptist church? If so, how? If not so, when do you first find the Baptist church in the world? Mr. Ray admits that the name does not occur in the Bible, and can not be found in history during the first fifteen centuries. Words are signs of ideas. If the idea had been there, the word would have been there. Hence we conclude there was no Baptist church until the sixteenth century. Nor have we 'confessed' that any part of the kingdom of Christ was wearing the name Baptist church until it apostatized. If it had not apostatized, it would not have worn the name; and as soon as it recovers from the apostasy, it will discard the name. Mr. Ray should not be satisfied with a fleshly succession, if he can make out such, for his proposition affirms identity in doctrine and practice. The pope's church has a better line of succession than the Baptist church, yet will Mr. Ray admit that the pope's church was built upon the rock? Succession proves nothing, unless it succeeds to the apostles' doctrine and practice, and this neither the

Catholic nor Baptist succession can claim. The churches that reformed with Mr. Campbell kept all there was of Baptist succession, and then they succeeded to the apostles' doctrine, practice, creed and name, by returning to the Bible.

But we are anxious that Mr. Ray shall give us a definition of a Baptist church. Is a body of baptized believers a Baptist church? Certainly not, for we have a body of baptized believers in the city of Bonham, and there is not a Baptist among them. What constitutes a Baptist? Can a man be a Baptist and not wear the name? Then the Waldenses and Donatists were not Baptists, and there was not a Baptist in the world for fifteen centuries. A Baptist and a Christian are not one and the same thing. Mr. Ray admits that there are Christians in the Methodist church. But these Christians are not Baptists, and since a man may be a Christian and not be a Baptist, Christianity and Baptistism are not one and the same thing! And we may have Christians and not have Baptists, and Christian churches and not Baptist churches! And this is exactly what we had for fifteen centuries of the Christian era. When a faction of the kingdom of Christ took the name Baptist church, and added the peculiarities that constituted it the Baptist church, then the Baptist church began, and not before. It was unheard of in the world until the sixteenth century.

But were we to admit that the Baptist church which Alex. Campbell tried to reform was the true church of Christ, that would not prove that the church of which Mr. Ray is a member is the true church. Mr. Ray does not belong to the church which A. Campbell tried to reform, and about which we made the 'good confession.' He belongs to the Missionary Baptist church, a body that had no existence fifty years ago! If Mr. Ray thinks he can find the Missionary Baptist church in the world prior to fifty years ago, we shall be pleased to have him come to the test. It is the identity of this modern sprout, and not the original primitive church, that he has to establish. Not only was there no Baptist church in the world for fifteen hundred years, but there was no Missionary Baptist church for eighteen hundred years! We challenge Mr. Ray to find it, or its peculiarities, during that period. Its name, its 'experiences' and its mourning-bench are all inventions of the present century. Some ten or twelve Baptist bodies now claim to be the true church, and to have the true succession, and Mr. Ray's church is one of the youngest of the lot! It is a dozen years the junior of Alex. Campbell's reformation! Is it not amusing to hear him talk about the church that was built upon the rock! "Upon this rock I will build the Missionary Baptist church

(eighteen hundred years after date), and I will give to Ray and Graves the keys of the kingdom, and whomsoever they shut out shall have no communion therein!" That is the way it will have to read, to prove Mr. Ray's identity. But if our friend says that the split in the Baptist church which produced the Missionary body did not originate a new church, then we say the split in the Baptist church which resulted in the reformation of the nineteenth century under A. Campbell did not originate a new church. We carried with us what truth there was in the old body; you carried its errors and traditions, and added others to them.

The editor of the MESSENGER is in no danger of lunacy, and his friends are not in alarm about him. He speaks the words of truth and soberness. Dr. Ray exhibits the symptoms that are alarming. He sees things that do not exist. He sees a ghost or goblin called 'Campbellism,' that no sane man ever saw, that constantly rises up before his distorted imagination, and causes him untold agony. Then he sees a line of Baptist churches all the way from the apostles to the sixteenth century, when there was not a Baptist church on the earth! Is not this lunacy?

But Mr. Campbell carried a letter to Europe, in which Henry Clay said he was the head and founder of a religious community. What does this prove? It only proves that Mr. Clay, like other men of the world, was ignorant of the true design of Mr. Campbell's labors. He wished to aid Mr. C, whom he greatly respected, and so wrote. There is no proof that Mr. Campbell ever used the letter, and if he did, he did not confess that he was the founder of a new church, for on hundreds of occasions with tongue and pen he denied that he was trying to establish a new religion, and affirmed that his work was reformatory in its character. Mr. Ray knows, this as well as anybody, yet for the effect it will have on ignorant Baptists, he reiterates it hundreds of times. It appears in all his writings and in all his debates.

But Mr. Segar, a historian, says that Mr. Campbell was the "head of the reformatory movement." Certainly. But does Mr. Segar say that Mr. Campbell founded a new church? Does his being at the head of the reformatory movement, to reform the Baptist church, constitute him the head of a new church? What then is Mr. Ray talking about? If Mr. Segar had said that Alex. Campbell started a new church, the statement would simply be false, as every intelligent reader knows, and could not serve Mr. Ray in this discussion.

But Mr. Moore says the so-called Christian church "came from zero to half a million in fifty years," and Mr. Ray is jubilant that it came from zero. It came from the Baptist church, and if that is zero, our friend is in a bad condition, for his Missionary body came from below zero, for it began a dozen years lower down the line than the "so-called Christian church"! How is that for low!

Mr. Ray's assertion that the true church can not apostatize, is in direct conflict with the Scriptures. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." Tim. 4:1. "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first." Thess. 2:3. How can there be a departure from the faith, unless one is in the faith, and a falling away, unless one is standing? Mr. Ray ought to read the letters to the churches:

"Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works, or else I will come unto thee quickly and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." Rev. 2.

Were these false Christians, and this church at Ephesus a false church? Now read the letter to the church at Sardis:

"I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead; be watchful and strengthen the things that remain, that are ready to die, for I have not found thy works perfect before God. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee. Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy. He that overcometh the same shall be clothed in white raiment."

Now to the church of the Laodiceans:

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would that thou wert cold or hot; so then because thou art lukewarm, I will spew thee out of my mouth; because thou sayest I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind and naked. I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear, and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve that thou mayest see. As many as I love I rebuke and chasten; be zealous therefore, and repent."

Only a false system of religion could cause Mr. Ray to so flatly contradict the Scriptures. We exhort him therefore

to repent, lest his candlestick be removed, or he be spewed out quickly.

We have never contended that Babylon is to be the bride of Christ; but there are Christians in Babylon, who are to come out of her and form a part of the true church, the Lamb's wife, and Mr. Ray holds the same view, for he says there are Christians in Home. Babylon is not a literal country, but has reference to the traditions and inventions of men, and just in so far as our Baptist friends have gone into error, so far are they in Babylon. They may not have made so great departures as the pope, but that they are not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church we are ready to show as soon as Mr. Ray shall come to the merits of the question. They are not identical in name, creed, organization, language, mode of conversion, design of baptism, perseverance of the saints, communion, work of the Spirit, faith, and various other matters. Mr. Ray makes a wreck of the figure when he represents Christians as coming out of Babylon and going into the Baptist church, and that the Baptist church is the bride of Christ! Pretty bride that, who refuses to wear the name of the Bridegroom! Which one of the Baptist churches is the bride of Christ? Is it the old Baptist church that was in the days of A. Campbell, or the young sprig to which Mr. Ray belongs? Or has Christ turned polygamist, and married ten or twelve brides?

In conclusion, we suggest to Mr. Ray a shorter method of proving the identity of the Missionary Baptist church, by the Bible. He must do it like the Methodist minister proved infant baptism. He was debating with a Baptist minister, and his opponent was pressing him to find the chapter and verse that mentioned the baptism of an infant. Finally he said it was in the same chapter that recorded the establishment of the Baptist church! If Dr. Ray will find the chapter that tells about the baptism of an infant, he will find the Missionary Baptist church in the same chapter. We are very sure he can not find it any where else.

[NOTE.—As predicted by many of the readers of the MESSENGER, our last chapter was too much for Dr. Ray, and he is disposed to fly from the proposition. He now says that he did not agree to affirm the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church, but "the church claims of Baptists and disciples." In fact, he is about to deny that he belongs to the Missionary Baptist church. It is strange the doctor did not make this discovery until we had published two chapters of the debate. We expected to show that the doctrine and practice of

the Missionary Baptist church was not apostolic, but we did not expect to make the doctor deny his church altogether. Is not this a glorious outcome for the great chieftain of the Missionaries in America, the hero of twenty battle-fields?]

[Baptist Flag.]

Our proposition was for the discussion of the "Church claims of Baptists and disciples," but Mr. Burnett attempts to dodge the issue by substituting "Missionary Baptist church." The name Missionary Baptist church is not the name of any church. The people with which we are identified are called "Baptists" and "Baptist churches." Of course they are missionary, but this is not a denominational name.

Mr. B. presumes upon the ignorance of his readers, when he tries to make the impression that the Baptists with whom we are identified are only a "sprout" from the so-called "Old-school"—anti-mission Baptists! This anti-mission faction is a small party that seceded in 1832, from the great Baptist family in America. This is admitted by their own historians.

See the proofs as arranged in our Baptist Succession, pp. 24, 25. We define a Baptist church to be a church of Christ. Yes, a church can be a Baptist church without wearing the name Baptist, just as a Pedobaptist church may be a Pedobaptist church without wearing the name Pedobaptist church. Baptist churches are Christian churches; and Christian churches are Baptist churches.

The idea that change of a name, or the addition of a name, destroys identity, is too foolish for any, except lunatics, to believe. The name of Abram was changed to Abraham and that of Jacob to Israel. Did these changes destroy the identity of these men? The servants of Christ have been called by a host of names, and nicknames, but this did not interrupt their identity. Though the words "Baptist church" are not associated thus in the Bible; yet the Baptist idea is in the Word of God, "the Baptist" was the name added to John, the first administrator of New Testament baptism. John was sent of God to baptize, and was therefore called "the Baptist." The churches of Christ have been sent to baptize, through ministers; therefore they are Baptist churches. The name "Baptist church" is in perfect harmony with the Bible. It is composed of two Bible words, and conveys a Bible idea, and is therefore a Bible name. John, who was surnamed "the Baptist" by the Holy Spirit, baptized Christ and the apostles, and they baptized more than John; therefore, they were Baptists. Christ and his apostles, who were Baptists, baptized disciples and organized

them into churches, that were to baptize others, through their ministers; therefore, these churches of Christ were Baptist churches. Among the multitude of religionists, as Baptists are the only people who maintain and administer baptism as did Christ and the apostles, it is peculiarly fortunate and providential that this Bible name "Baptist" has been given to them by common consent. The church which now has this significant Baptist name is the identical church established by Christ himself. Mr. T. R. Burnett has made this

#### GOOD CONFESSION

in the Messenger, when he says "that Christ founded his church upon the Rock, and that it has been there ever since." Of this same church, the Messenger says: "In the days of Alexander Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore, according to the Christian Messenger, the church formed by Christ, which has continued to the present time, was called the Baptist church in the days of Alexander Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the Messenger was forced to say: "With Alexander Campbell, we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his co-adjutors started the reformation." Now, according to the good confession of the Christian Messenger, the church which was founded by Christ, and which continued on the rock till the present time, was wearing the name, "Baptist church" in the days of Alexander Campbell; and that the kingdom of God was with the Baptists before Mr. Campbell started the reformation of the nineteenth century. This is a "noble confession." We have proved by the Christian Messenger itself that the church now called the Baptist church, had its origin with Jesus Christ. Mr. Campbell bore the same testimony, in his debate with McCalla where he says: "From the apostolic age to the present time, the sentiments of the Baptists, and their practice of baptism, have had a continuous chain of advocates, and monuments of their existence in every century can be produced." p. 38. This is the emphatic testimony of Mr. Campbell to the claim of Baptist succession and existence in every century, from the apostolic age to the present time. Whether it was called the "Baptist church" all the time does not affect its identity or apostolic origin.

#### THE DISCIPLE CHURCH

had its origin with A. Campbell, in the present century. In 1847, Mr. Henry Clay said:

"Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful

devotion to the education of youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States."—Memoirs Alex. Campbell, p. 558.

Also, Mr. Charles V. Segar, a leading Campbellite, in his life of Alexander Campbell, which stands endorsed by the disciples, page 25, says:

"Alexander Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the recognized head of a new religious movement, the purpose of which was to restore primitive Christianity in all its simplicity and beauty. Out of this movement has grown a people, who choose to call themselves Christians or disciples, now numbering not less than five hundred thousand members in the United States."

Mr. Segar was not so ignorant or dishonest as to deny that Alexander Campbell was the recognized head of the new religious movement which brought into existence the church of the disciples.

II. IDENTITY.—*Baptists propose to baptize the children of God, while the disciples propose to baptize the children of the devil.*

Baptists hold the Bible doctrine that "the only suitable candidate [for baptism] is a person who has been born of the Spirit, and who is united to Christ by faith." Rel. Ency. p. 181. Mr. H. T. Anderson, a leading Campbellite author, says: "The Baptists baptize men because they are Christians, while the disciples baptize men to make them Christians. If the Baptists are right in this, the disciples are wrong." Ch. Discussion, p. 405. The same doctrine is taught by Campbell, Lard and the leading disciples in general. Mr. Lard contends, that in baptism "we cease to be children of Satan, and become children of God." Ch. Dis., p. 101. Here the difference between Baptists and Campbellites is sharply defined. It is the difference between light and darkness, truth and falsehood, God and the devil. If the Campbellites are correct in baptizing the children of the devil to make them Christians, then the Baptists are fearfully wrong. If Baptists are correct in baptizing the children of God, then the Campbellites are anti-christian when they propose to baptize the children of the devil. To the law and to the testimony. Love to God must precede baptism and church membership. Jesus says: "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John 14:15. "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God." 1 John 4:7. To baptize one before he loves God is rebellion and treason, but if he loves God before baptism, he is born of God and knows God before baptism. Therefore, the Baptists are correct in this fundamental faith and practice of baptizing only such as give evidence of spiritual regeneration. He who

believes with the heart "on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." 1 John 5:10. This internal witness is "the love of God [which] is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5:5. When we possess this experience of grace, "We know that we have passed from death into life, because we love the brethren." 1 John 3:14. This love of God which is received and enjoyed before one is a scriptural subject for baptism is the grace insisted upon by the Baptists for which they are so much mocked and ridiculed by Campbellites. As these poor deluded souls have no such *experience*, having been immersed as children of the devil, they come to the absurd conclusion that no one else possesses such an experience. They, having a form of Godliness but denying the power thereof, become religious Pharisees and hypocrites.

We have seen that the Baptists have their origin from Christ and the apostles, while the disciples sprang from Alexander Campbell in the present century. Also, Baptists baptize men because they have been born of the Spirit, while the disciples baptize the children of the devil to make them the children of God.

[Christian Messenger.]

Mr. Ray proposes to discuss the "church claims of Baptists and disciples." But what Baptist church?—which claims? There are ten or twelve bodies in the United States claiming to be the Baptist church. Mr. Ray does not belong to all these bodies. He does not eat with them all. He eats with the Missionary Baptist church, and this alone. He claims membership in this church, and they recognize him as their representative and flag-bearer. We intend that he shall affirm their doctrine and practice, or decline. There is a body of people in the United States called the Missionary Baptist church. They call themselves by this name. It is printed in their creeds, their articles of faith, and in the minutes of their associations. Not long ago one of their preachers wrote a letter to the Texas Baptist, suggesting that the word 'Missionary' be dropped from the name. How could it be dropped, unless it is at present a part of the name? Mr. Ray can not escape from the proposition by asserting that there is no such body of people. He knows that there is, and he must affirm their doctrine and practice, or retreat from the field. Dr. Ray is not a member of the Baptist church which Alex. Campbell tried to reform. He does not hold the doctrine of that church. That church held to the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, and to unconditional election and reprobation. Does Dr. Ray believe this doctrine? If so, we shall have some debating. Will he affirm that the Philadel-

phia Confession of Faith is identical with the apostles' doctrine? He must do this, or align himself with the new church, the 'modern sprout,' which is not yet fifty years old! He must take position somewhere. He can not scatter himself all the way from the commencement of the century to the present time, and among all the Baptist bodies of America. No wonder our friend begins to shy at the proposition. He does not like the doctrine of the old Baptists, and he does not like the age of the new! He is in a strait betwixt two. He desires to depart and be with the ancient primitive Baptists, but he does not want to have to affirm their doctrine of unconditional election! He would prefer that we should not annoy him with the word 'doctrine' in the proposition, but let him debate his intangible thing he calls "church claims!" We can not do it. We are going to show that the Missionary Baptist church does not hold the doctrine and practice of the apostolic church. If Dr. Ray can not meet the issue, he is at liberty to retire from the field, and let his friend J. E. Graves try his hand.

Mr. Ray's statement that the Primitive Baptists split off from the Missionaries in 1832 is without foundation. Whence the name Primitive Baptist, and the name Missionary Baptist? And how comes it that the Primitive Baptists have the creed and doctrine of the old Redstone association, while Mr. Ray's church has a new name and new creed? Where was the Missionary Baptist church prior to 1882? Dr. Ray can not find the name or doctrine prior to that time. But we care not which Baptist church he belongs to—whether the old sprout or the new sprout—there was no Baptist church of any kind in the world prior to the sixteenth century. Have we not called in vain upon Mr. Ray to produce it? He has not so much as found the name in history during the first fifteen centuries.

Our friend has a unique way of finding the Baptist church in the Bible. He says it is composed of two Bible words, and must therefore be a Bible idea. By the same process we can find Beelzebub's church in the Bible! We have the word church and the word Beelzebub in the Bible, and by putting these two words together we have Beelzebub church! Furthermore, we do read of the 'synagogue of Satan' in the New Testament, but not of the Baptist synagogue. Satan can come nearer finding his church in the Bible than Dr. Ray! If our friend has not patented this new logic, we will lend it to the Methodist preachers to prove their doctrine of infant baptism. They can find infant in the Bible, and baptism in the Bible, and by putting these two words together they will have infant baptism! But Dr. Ray can not do even this well when he reads

the Bible Union version. His Baptist friends have translated the word Baptist out of this translation, and left him in a worse condition than Beelzebub and the Methodists!

Dr. Ray defines a Baptist church to be "a church of Christ." Why then call it a Baptist church? If you have nothing more nor less than a church of Christ, why call it anything more or less than a church of Christ? The very fact that you have a new name is proof that you have a new thing. The word being there, the idea is there, as you said about the name Baptist in the Bible. Churches of Christ were not called Baptist churches in the days of the apostles, when men spoke and wrote by inspiration. In manufacturing a new title, you differ from them, and are therefore not identical. But Mr. Ray says that a change of name does not destroy the identity. It destroys the identity in name, and also destroys the identity in doctrine, for Paul flatly condemns the wearing of any name in preference to the name of Him who was crucified for you. Cor. 1:13. Baptists, in preferring to wear the name of the servant before that of the Master, commit a very grievous sin, and are not identical in doctrine or practice with the apostolic church. But Mr. Ray says the names of Abram and Jacob were changed. Yes, God authorized these changes, and they were all right; but when did he authorize the name of his church to be changed to the Baptist church? This name was unheard of in the world until the sixteenth century. God's people were to be called by a new name, "which the mouth of the Lord should name," but when did the mouth of the Lord name the Baptist church? It was named by men in the sixteenth century, when a sect arose that wished to wear that title. But 'the churches of Christ were sent to baptize, and were therefore Baptist churches,' says Mr. Ray. The churches of Christ were sent to preach the gospel also; shall we therefore call them Preachist churches? They were sent to administer the Lord's supper; shall we therefore call them Suppist churches? This is logic for lunatics! But Mr. Ray says John was named Baptist, and all the people he baptized were Baptists. John was not named Baptist; that was his professional title. "Thou shalt call his name John," said the angel to Zacharias. But if he were named Baptist, and all he baptized thereby became Baptists, then all Christ baptized became Christians. And since John's ministry was over and his baptizing had ceased before Jesus said, "Upon this rock I will build my church," the Baptists which Mr. Ray finds along the banks of the Jordan were no part of the church that was built upon the rock. It is also a little singular, that of the multitudes of Baptists that John made at the Jordan, not

one of them is ever afterwards called a Baptist in the New Testament!

Mr. Ray says a church may be a Baptist church and not wear the name Baptist church. Will he name one such church in the whole world — one Baptist church that does not wear the name? If he will, we will give up the question. There is no such church, and Mr. Ray knows there is no such church on the earth today, and never was, and only asserts this to save his cause. If the Baptist church can not exist without the name, then there was no Baptist church till the sixteenth century, for the name can not be found prior to that time. So, away goes Mr. Ray's line of succession! Ignorant Baptists have been led to believe that there was a line of Baptist churches all the way from the apostles to the present time; but we have shown that there was not a Baptist church on earth till the sixteenth century, and have challenged the doctors to find the long-lost link of fifteen centuries out of the chain. But they do not do it. Mr. Ray will not try to do it. Is it not singular, if the churches of Christ are Baptist churches, that in modern times not one church can be found that does not wear the name, and in ancient times not one church can be found that did wear the name! And not one for fifteen hundred years!!!

Mr. Ray copies a large portion of his previous speech into his article this week, and presents it as if it were new matter, and had not already been answered in these columns. He is like the young preacher who had but two sermons, and when he had to preach three times in one place he was compelled to preach one of his sermons twice! When Mr. Bay has nothing else to say, he repeats his assertion about Henry Clay, Chas. V. Segar, and the "good confession." Certainly, we made the good confession, that a part of the kingdom of God apostatized and became a sect, and went to wearing the name Baptist church, in the sixteenth century. Certainly, Mr. Segar said Alex. Campbell was at the head of the religious movement—when the Baptist churches began to move toward Jerusalem—but Mr. Campbell never set up a new church.

Mr. Ray ventures to give us one short scrap on the proposition—the doctrine and practice of his church. He says Baptists baptize the children of God, while Campbellites baptize the children of the devil. Baptists are therefore identical with the apostolic church in this respect, he thinks. Let us see. Did Peter on pentecost baptize the children of God, or persons desirous of becoming the children of God? If they were children of God before baptism, they were children before they had remission of sins, for he commanded them to be baptized for re-

mission of sins. The Baptist practice does not seem to harmonize with Peter's language on this occasion. Nor does it harmonize with the commission. Jesus said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Baptists never say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized!" Their practice causes them to reverse the language of the Savior. He joined faith and baptism together, in order to salvation. Baptists separate what the Lord hath joined together, and place salvation before baptism. Who authorized them to do this? And who authorized them to lay violent hands on Peter's language, and twist it about until they have remission of sins before baptism, when Peter placed baptism before remission? Neither Peter nor Christ contemplated the baptism of children of God, unless persons can be children of God before they are saved and have remission of sins. The Baptist doctrine does not seem to harmonize with the language addressed to Paul at his baptism: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." If he was a child of God, before baptism, he was a child before his sins were washed away. Baptists have curious children of God—children whose sins are not washed away, who are not saved, and whose sins are not remitted! Surely Mr. Ray's church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church. But Mr. Ray says that love must precede baptism, (which is correct,) and then he quotes 1 John 4:7, where the writer is talking to Christians and uses the language, "He that loveth is born of God," and applies this to unbaptized persons and says they are born of God! This is about like all of Mr. Ray's perversions. What is love? "This is the love of God, that ye keep his commandments." The principle of love must exist in the heart before baptism, but it is obedient love that puts itself forth in acts which is the test that one is born of God. How much proof is there in a disobedient love, an unbaptized love? But we presume that Dr. Ray is aware that the word born in his proof-text is translated begotten in the revised version, and that it is admitted to be correct by quite all the scholarly world. Then he that loves God is quickened or begotten, and when he is born of water or baptized he is a child in the kingdom. It is one of Mr. Ray's premeditated, gratuitous slanders, that the so-called 'Campbellites' mock at Baptists for professing to love God before baptism. He never heard one of them do it. The so-called 'Campbellites' themselves profess to love God before baptism. And Mr. Ray is in error when he says that love to God is the Baptist 'experience.' No sir. In this country they

relate a dream, a vision, or tell how they feel, or how they did feel when they fancied that God by a direct operation of his Spirit washed away their sins. This is the kind of 'experience' that Christian people tell Baptists is not in accordance with New Testament teaching. In apostolic days sinners confessed their faith in Christ—not their dreams or feelings—and were baptized on this confession. There is no account that any one ever confessed his love, as a qualification for baptism, as Dr. Ray says Baptists now do. Will the gentleman please give us an example of the kind? In ancient times baptism itself was the confession of love. The Baptists have their experience in the wrong place also. Paul assigns it to the Christian life. He says, "Tribulation worketh experience." In this the Baptists have departed from the apostolic model.

They have changed the name of Christ's church, have a man-made creed, confess feelings instead of faith, have changed baptism from its place in the Christian system, teach that faith cometh by praying and not by hearing, have set up a bar around the communion table to exclude a portion of the children of God, teach the unconditional perseverance of the saints, do not organize their congregations after the apostolic model, with "elders in every church," and do not use Bible words for Bible things. In all these counts, and more, in doctrine and practice, we find the Baptist church not identical with the apostolic church.

We trust Dr. Ray will publish this article in full, and not mutilate it as he did our other, by leaving out half of it.

[Baptist Flag.]

Mr. Burnett denies being "in danger of lunacy;" but how shall we account for his unfortunate self contradictions? After admitting that the original apostolic church, which has continued to the present time, was called "the Baptist church," he goes back on himself, and denies that the Baptists have their origin from Christ. Mr. B. pretends that Henry Clay "was ignorant" for saying that Mr. Campbell was "the head and founder" of the "religious" community, now known as the Campbellite church! The man that does not know this fact is stupidly "ignorant" of one of the well established historical facts of the present century. But Mr. Campbell did use the letter of Mr. Clay, which makes him the "head and founder" of the church while in England. See Richardson's Memoirs, Vol. 2, p. 548. Also, Mr. Segar, the Campbellite historian, did say that A. Campbell was "the recognized head of a new religious movement;" and that "out of this movement has grown a peo-

ple, who choose to call themselves Christians, or disciples." Church Discussion, p. 78. Campbell was the head and founder of a "new religious movement, whose members choose to call themselves Christians, or disciples." It is just as certain that A. Campbell was the head and founder of the self-styled "Christian church" as that John Wesley was the head and founder of the Methodist church. The denial of that which they know to be a fact, upon the part of some of Mr. Campbell's disciples, furnishes a sad evidence of the deep depravity of the human heart. Mr. Burnett tries to dodge the glaring fact of the human origin of his church, by affirming that "the so-called Christian church" "came from the Baptist church!" That Mr. Campbell's "reformatory movement" was to "reform the Baptist church"!! But Mr. Campbell said: "We are not reformed Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, or any such thing." Millennial Harbinger, New series, Vol. 3, p. 338.

The nearest relationship that these modern disciples can claim to the Baptists is, that many of them were excluded from Baptist fellowship, in 1827, for heresy. After said exclusion the so-called Christian, or disciple church was organized. Mr. Campbell claims that it started "from nothing." See Mill. Har., Vol. 6, p. 106.

The insinuation that the Baptists with whom we stand identified had their origin from the anti-mission Baptists is utterly untrue. We call upon Mr. Burnett to withdraw his false charge. It may be that he did it ignorantly.

The complaints against certain churches of Asia do not prove the apostasy of the kingdom any more than the faults of one or two members would prove the apostasy of a local church. The departure from the faith and falling away has reference to the anti-Christians that went out from the true churches. The kingdom did not fall away. The kingdom of Christ is to "stand forever." The Messenger says:

"We challenge Mr. Ray to find it, or its peculiarities, during that period. Its name, its 'experiences' and its mourning-bench are all inventions of the present century."<sup>1</sup>

In our issue of Nov. 29, we found "the Baptist" name in the Bible. Will Mr. Burnett be kind enough to tell what he means by the exclamation: "Pretty bride that, who refuses to wear the name of the bridegroom?" The real proper name of the Savior is "Jesus." "His name shall be called JESUS." Must the church—the bride—call herself Jesus! or Mrs. Jesus? This would be blasphemy. Will Mr. B. say that the church should call her members Jesus-ites — Jesuits? This is the name assumed by the most treacherous of the Romish priesthood.

Does this name constitute them the true church? What would the Messenger have us do? Shall the church—the bride—call herself Christ! or Mrs. Christ!! the official name of the Savior? This is blasphemy, also. The Messiah has been called by fifty names in the Word of God. Shall the church assume all these as church names? Or shall the church assume all the names by which the followers of Christ have been called? If so, because the Savior called his disciples "sheep," the bride—the church—must call herself "sheep church!" What nonsense! Has the Messenger gone "tee-totally" deranged? The Campbellite would-be bride is a little too fast. The time for the marriage of the Lamb is yet future. It is not modest for a woman to call herself by the name of her intended husband, before the marriage. Any man with a few grains of Bible sense, ought to know that the Savior will never be united in marriage to this daughter of Alexander Campbell, born in the present century. It seems that this impudent ecclesiastical pretender was born crazy, on the subject of names.

We have already shown that every one must experience the love of God shed abroad in the heart, by the Holy Ghost prior to baptism. This experience told is the confession of faith in Christ which should be made prior to baptism. As the disciples propose to baptize the children of the devil, they are destitute of such.

The Baptist "mourning-bench"! Ever since the Campbellite church was born, it has been howling madly against the "mourning-bench." Many years ago, while making a pastor's visit, an old lady hearing the conversation, remarked that she "was a Baptist once, but when the scales fell from her eyes she left the Baptist church." "Pray, Madam," said we, "what did you see among the Baptists so ugly that you could not remain?" After some hesitation she said the "mourner's bench." We asked her whether she objected to the height, style, or kind of wood of which the bench was made? "Oh, no," said she, "it is the mourning to which I object." We called for the New Testament and read: "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye double minded. Be afflicted and mourn, and weep, let your laughter be turned into mourning, and your joy into heaviness. Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he will lift you up." James 4:8-10.

After which, we remarked that this woman had left the Baptists, because they encouraged obedience to the apostolic command. She said: "I can't argue," and kept silent. But Mr. Burnett can argue against the direct commands of inspiration.

The Campbellite leaders know that Baptists have never made the "mourning-bench" a condition of membership. It is mourning on account of the sin that they hate. Jesus says: "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted." Matt. 5:3. The Campbellite tirade against the "bench" is as foolish as an out-cry against the use of chairs or seats in the church houses! Yes, with equal sense, or nonsense, they could come down on the use of meeting houses!! If those sinners that James commands to "mourn and weep" should have happened to sit on a bench, they would have been on the hated "mourning bench." The "godly sorrow" which works repentance unto life causes the penitent sinner to "mourn and weep," over his sins. The church which opposes this is anti-christian.

[Christian Messenger.]

In this lengthy, loose, logicless tirade, Dr. Ray has made but one solitary point on the proposition in question, and that is his poor, pitiful plea for the mourning-bench; and we shall show that there is no argument in that. He still insists that we are inconsistent, to admit that the Baptist church of A. Campbell's day was a part of the kingdom of Christ, and yet deny that the Baptists have their origin from Christ. We have shown that Christ and the apostles did not establish the Baptist church, and that there was no Baptist church in the world for fifteen hundred years. All the peculiarities that constituted it the Baptist church were added to the religion of Christ after the beginning. Its sectarian name, human creed and unscriptural doctrines and practices, which constituted it the Baptist church, are no part of Christianity, but innovations and departures. With these, it is a sect in the kingdom of God; without these, it is the religion of Jesus Christ. Alex. Campbell induced many of the congregations forming this Baptist body to abandon their departures and apostasies, and when they did so, they were simply churches of Christ. We trust Mr. Ray will no longer expose his lunacy by pretending not to understand so plain a matter as this.

Last week our friend labored hard to find the Baptist church in the Bible, and by scrapping and patching the Scriptures he thought he had succeeded well enough to deceive ignorant Baptists; but when we showed that he fell considerably behind Beelzebub and the Methodists, he abandons the effort altogether, and now says that since Christ's people were called by a variety of names in the New Testament, there is no way of determining what they should be called. And he asks if it would not be right to say Mrs. Jesus, or Mrs. Christ, or sheep's church! That

is about like Dr. Ray. He belongs to an unscriptural body, with an unscriptural name, and he has very blind eyes when it comes to seeing the true church. He hopes everybody is in the same condition with himself. No man who does not belong to an unscriptural church has any trouble to find the proper title (or the people of God in the Bible. We have the best of reasons for not saying Mrs. Jesus, Mrs. Christ, sheep's church, and Baptist church. No inspired writer ever used those terms. There was no sheep's church or Baptist church in that age of the world, and no man had any use for such outlandish lingo. The apostles called it the church of Christ, the church of God, and called the members disciples and Christians. It was not until the anti-christs were born — such as Dr. Ray and the pope — that unscriptural titles began to be used. The personal name of the Savior was Jesus; his official title was Christ; the word Christ means anointed; in ancient times prophets, priests and kings were anointed; and since Jesus is the prophet, priest and king of the new dispensation, he is called the Christ or Anointed. By taking his official name, we take him as our prophet, priest and king. Baptists, by taking the official title of John, take him as their — baptist! Is there not a difference between taking Christ as our prophet, priest and king, and taking John as our baptist? Well, that is just the difference between Baptists and Christians. The reader can judge who has gone "tee-totally deranged" on the name question, and who has gone tee-totally out of the Bible. Dr. Ray would no doubt like to make the impression that the "ecclesiastical pretender" was "born crazy" on the name, since she comes so near running him crazy about his unscriptural name, but we think Dr. Ray will have to be "born again" before he can appreciate the principle that actuates Christian people in discarding all names not found in the Scriptures. If we could not make better pretensions to finding our ecclesia in the Bible than he does, we would confess to being "born crazy," and quit the field. The official name of the Savior was conferred upon his followers by the apostles. At Antioch this name was given. Acts 11:26. James says they were called by this worthy name. Jas. 2:7. Paul says the whole family in heaven and earth is named this name. Eph. 3:15. Peter called his brethren by this name. 1 Pet. 4:16. Paul almost persuaded Agrippa to be a Christian. Acts xxvi. 28. No apostle ever called a disciple of Christ a Baptist, or persuaded any person to be a Baptist. In this respect Mr. Ray and his church are not identical with the apostolic church.

But our friend says we are a little too previous in giving the bride the husband's name, as the marriage has not yet taken

place. The apostles were too previous also, for they gave the name of Christ to his church in their day. The marriage of the Lamb, in Revelation, is future, but there is a sense in which the church was married to Christ in the apostolic age. "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." Eph. 5:23. "Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing." Eph. 5:24. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it." Eph. 5:25. "For I am jealous over you, with a godly jealousy, for I have espoused you to one husband." 2 Cor, 11:2. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth, but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband; . . . wherefore my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruits unto God." Rom. 7: 2-4. We suppose Dr. Ray thinks that Christians are not yet divorced from the law and married to Christ, and that they are not to bring forth fruits unto God until after the resurrection! And that Christ is not yet the head of the church! And the apostles and early Christians were immodest to assume to wear his name before the resurrection morn! This is teetotal nonsense.

Mr. Ray says the denial that A. Campbell was the head of a new church proves the deep depravity of the human heart. Mr. Ray's falsification of the facts of history, when he knows better, proves the deep depravity of the human heart. All the evidence is against him. Every person connected with the reformatory movement condemns him as bearing false witness against his neighbors. Alex. Campbell said he never started a new church. In a letter addressed to an editor at New Orleans, who had so stated, he said: "I have always repudiated all human heads and human names for the people of the Lord, and shall feel very thankful if you will correct the erroneous impression which your article may have made in thus representing me as the founder of a religious denomination." The twenty churches of Mahoning Baptist association, all of which laid down their unscriptural name and creed and went to the Bible, declared that they did not establish a new church. A hundred Baptist churches that went into the reformation declared with one voice that they did not establish a new church or new religion, but elevated the old church to its original apostolic standard. Not one person in that vast multitude claimed that he received his religion from A. Campbell, and not one would wear his name.

It was their boast that every jot and tittle of their doctrine and practice came from the New Testament, and was eighteen hundred years old. Had they, like their Missionary brethren, established a new sect, with a sectarian name and a human creed, and doctrines and practices not found in the New Testament, Mr. Ray's charges might be in place. But as they did not do this, Mr. Ray has slandered these people, and should withdraw his false statement and repent of his wickedness. Nor were these excluded Baptists, as our friend intimates, although Baptists are very prone to exclude their brethren when they begin to go by the New Testament rather than "Baptist usage." We have known them to 'exclude' some who had already left the fold. But in this case there was nobody to do the excluding. Who excluded the twenty churches of Mahoning association, and the hundred churches that went bodily into the reformation? Is there a higher power among Baptists than a sovereign church? We have never found a Baptist editor or preacher who could tell us when Alex. Campbell was excluded from the Baptist church. Will Mr. Ray inform us? These matters are in no wise connected with the proposition under discussion, but we turn out of the way to notice them because Mr. Ray persists in discussing them instead of showing that the Missionary Baptist church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church.

Mr. Ray says the 'experience' that is told by Baptists of love shed abroad in the heart is the confession of faith required by the Scriptures "as a prerequisite to baptism. A confession of love shed in the heart is not a confession of faith, but a confession of love shed in the heart. Is Mr. Ray utterly ignorant of the use of words? When the eunuch said, "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" did Philip say, "If thou canst confess to a feeling of love shed abroad in the heart thou mayest?" He made no such confession, and such confession was unknown in the apostolic age. Paul said, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus" — not the love shed in the heart. Baptists do not confess the Lord Jesus with the mouth, nor confess their faith in him as the Son of God, but confess to feeling something in their hearts! Will Mr. Ray please give us an example of this modern confession, in use among Missionary Baptists? We know he will not, for there is no such example in the whole New Testament.

But the mourning-bench! And that good old sister from whose eyes the scales fell! Well, we have seen many such sisters. When the scales of ignorance fall from their eyes, and they begin to get the light of the gospel into their minds, they

do not have much further use for the Baptist church, or any other human institution, or for such blind leaders as Mr. Ray. If our friend had been desirous of converting the old sister from the error of her way, he would have opened the Bible, and, instead of reading what Jesus said to his DISCIPLES, and what James wrote to his erring BRETHREN, he would have gone to some case of conversion where Peter or Paul or Philip used the mourning-bench as the Baptists do now. Why did he not go to pentecost, and show that when the three thousand were pierced to the heart by the preaching of Peter, they were invited to bow down at an altar of straw and let Peter and the rest of the apostles pray for them? And why did he not go to Damascus, where Saul was a mourner, and tell how Ananias came to him and told him to pray on until he had got religion and then arise and be baptized because his sins were washed away! And why did he not go down into the wilderness, "unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza," and show how the eunuch bowed down by the wayside and prayed until he felt love shed abroad in the heart! This would have convinced the old sister, and brought her back into the Baptist fold. As Mr. Ray did not refer to these cases, we presume he knew they would not answer his purpose, and so he went and read her something that had no bearing on the question, and indulged in some foolish talk about the height and width of the bench and the kind of timber it was made of. When Mr. Ray opposes the Catholic confessional, and the priest asks him whether it is the width or height of the confessional, or the size of the window through which penitents confess, that he does not like, he must not grow indignant and say the priest ought to be in the lunatic asylum! The mourning-bench is the Methodist confessional, and is as purely a Methodist invention as the Catholic confessional is an invention of popery. The Baptists borrowed it from the Methodists not eighty years ago. Dr. Graves advised his brethren to let the Methodists and negroes keep it, but Dr. Ray says the 'Campbellites' oppose it because they do not mourn for sin! Which one of these Missionaries shall we take to prove his doctrine apostolic? Christians do not oppose chairs or seats in a meeting-house, because the apostles had these, but they oppose the mourning-bench because the apostles did not have this. Mr. Ray can not find it in the Bible, and he can not find it in the world until one hundred years ago. It came from New England, and from the Methodists, and not from the Bible, and has no more scriptural authority than infant baptism. It is not as old as the Baptist church, and very little older than Mr. Ray's Missionary sprout. Our friend reads James to very little pur-

pose, else he would see that he is addressing his brethren, when he says 'weep and mourn,' and he calls them brethren only two verses below where Mr. Ray quotes. Does our Missionary friend invite his brethren to come to the anxious seat and weep and mourn? We suppose he had nothing else to quote, the reason he produced this, for it has no bearing upon the question. Christian people teach sinners to have a sorrow for sin—a godly sorrow that worketh repentance—and we do not measure this sorrow by the length of the face or length of the groan, or the number of times one goes to the mourning-bench, but by the reformation of life which follows. And we shall believe our sorrow and repentance are as good as Mr. Ray's, until we see more evidence of reform on his part than we have seen yet.

We have now shown that the Baptist church is not identical with the apostolic church in name, creed, origin, confession, design of baptism, its relation of experiences and use of the mourning-bench. We have other counts to add to these as the discussion progresses.

[Baptist Flag.]

It is wholly untrue; we did not publish "two chapters of the debate," under "the proposition" fixed up by Mr. Burnett. We invited him to the discussion of the respective "church claims of Baptists and disciples." Mr. Burnett has resorted to the cowardly trick of fixing up an entirely different proposition. Unless he is an ignoramus he knows that there is no denomination known in history as the 'Missionary Baptist church!' By inventing a new denominational name, and then quibbling over that name, he hopes to escape the discussion of the characteristic differences between Baptists and disciples, as he knows that he is identified with a human society, which can not bear investigation. Let him come up to the discussion of the respective church claims of Baptists and disciples, or back out. We do not believe that he will dare to engage in a fair investigation of our church claims.

We are discussing the church claims of the Baptists, with whom we are identified, and the church claims of the disciples of A. Campbell, with whom T. R. Burnett is identified. Does the Messenger understand? These Baptists are *missionary*, but they are not known as a denomination as "the Missionary Baptist church." They are not even known as *the* Baptist church.

In the encyclopedias, and the histories of denominations, they are known simply as "Baptists," while those "ten or twelve bodies" have other distinguishing names. All these little Baptist "bodies" in the United States, with other names added,

which either originated with men, or broke off from the Baptists, put together, would not number much more, if any, than are received by *the Baptists* in one year.

We have already answered the silly twaddle about the name. The term Anabaptists has been erroneously applied to our ancestors, from the third century to the present. But as the term "Baptist" was applied by inspiration to the first administrator of baptism, and as the churches of Christ are specially charged with the administration of baptism, through their ministers, it is proper and scriptural to apply the term *Baptist* to them. Especially is this proper since the multiplication of the sects. Should all the vast medley of a thousand different sects, holding the doctrines of men and devils, be called by the same name, it would make "confusion worse confounded." Then all the so-called Christendom would become something like the Campbellite church, which endorses all the heresies of fifteen centuries. Mr. Campbell said:

"Every sort of doctrine has been proclaimed, by almost all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners and with the supposed sanction of the begun reformation." Mill. Har., Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 64.

Having adopted such a principle, no wonder that the venerable Thos. Campbell, the grand-father of the Campbellite church, was constrained to confess that the "reformation" had resulted in:

"Verbal contentions, from which came envy, strife, evil speaking, unjust suspicions, perverse disputings—rather than Godly edification, which is in faith."

Again, Mr. Thomas Campbell says:

"We have forsaken terra firma, and are again out at sea amidst the rocks and vortices that have absorbed every adventurer from Arius to the present day. And, indeed, if we are to calculate the future by the past, especially for the last ten years, we might live to see an exhibition of all the curious questions and perplexing controversies of the last fifteen centuries upon the face of the periodicals professedly in favor of the proposed reformation." Mill. Har., Vol. 6, pp. 272-273.

Some of the Campbellite preachers have the impudence to call this miserable ecclesiastical Babel "*the* Christian church." Jesus said: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, and shall deceive many." Matt. 24:4, 5. Yes, it is one of the leading characteristics of false teachers to make a great ado over the name of Christ—"in my name." What they lack in doctrine they try to make up in bluster for the NAME of Christ. False churches are represented in prophecy by false and impudent women. Of these the prophet says:

"And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach." Is. 4:1.

*Women:* Symbols of false churches. Seven—here used indefinitely to denote many. *One man;* Jesus Christ. He does not choose them, but they *take hold* of him, for a pretense. *Eat our own bread;* bread represents doctrine. These churches reject the doctrine of Christ, and feed on their own doctrine. *Wear our own apparel;* these false churches reject the apparel—righteousness of Christ—and are trying to save themselves by their *own* works of righteousness which they have done. ONLY LET US BE CALLED BY THY NAME. They have no use for Christ, his doctrine, or his righteousness. They wish to be called by the name of Christ "to take away their reproach." The Campbellite church is raving to take away the reproach of her origin by calling herself "*the Christian church,*" or the "*Church of Christ.*" That church of which A. Campbell was "the head and founder" is no more the church of Christ than A. Campbell is Jesus Christ.

Mr. Burnett's charge that the Baptists (with whom we are identified,; had their origin from the so-called Old School or "Primitive" Baptists, betrays an ignorance which is surprising. That the anti-mission "hard shell" Baptists seceded from the Baptists is admitted by their own historians. This secession, upon the part of our anti-mission brethren, occurred at different times in different parts of the country. In Virginia the separation took place in the year 1832. Elder S. Trott, an "Old School Baptist" of distinction, says of the separation:

"This brought brethren, churches and associations that had been groaning under the burdens of human inventions and impositions in religion, to separate themselves, some sooner and some later, from the whole mass of the popular religion and religionists, and to take a stand as a distinct people, upon the Old Baptist standard. The holding of the Scriptures as the only and a perfect rule of faith and practice, and Christ as the foundation, the head, and the life of the church, the only source and medium of salvation. This separation occasioned the splitting of several associations, and many churches. We took, as a distinguishing appellation, the name, 'Old School Baptists.'" Religious Denominations in the U. S. and G. B. p. 87.

Here is the candid confession of a leading anti-mission Baptist, that the brethren now claiming to be "Old School," or "Primitive" Baptists separated themselves from the body of the denomination, and took a stand "as a distinct people"; and at that time, about 1832, took the appellation or name, "Old School Baptists." Therefore, according to Elder Trott, there was no

body of Baptists in the world calling themselves "Old School" prior to the year 1832.

Dr. John Watson, a leading preacher and writer among the anti-mission brethren, of Tennessee, says: "After our painful separation from the Missionaries in 1836, a number of churches in the bounds of the old Concord association, met together and formed the Stone River Association." Old Baptist, p. 36.

Dr. J. B. Jeter says:

"The class of Baptists described in the above extract were called, in some places, Old School, and in others, from the name of the place at which they held their seceding convention—'Black Rock' Baptists. They separated themselves from the Regular Baptists about the time of the rise of Mr. Campbell's Reformation." Campbellism Re-examined, p. 33.

In the face of these, and other proofs to the contrary, it must be a bad cause which prompts the MESSENGER to utter that which is not true. The Philadelphia Association was the first Baptist Association organized in America. It was organized in 1707, and has been meeting regularly for about one hundred and seventy-five years. The Baptists of this Association have maintained the same "faith and practice" during the whole time. They were in favor of missions from the start. The anti-mission element among them did not get strong enough to make a respectable split. Will Mr. B. have so little regard for the truth as to say that these Baptists belong to a sprout not yet fifty years old? We stand associated with the same denomination of Baptists which existed in America nearly 250 years ago. They existed with the same faith and practice, and name too, nearly 200 years before the Campbellites were excluded, or the "hard shells" seceded. The Baptists of America number largely more than two millions, while the "Old School," anti-mission, new party number about 30 or 40 thousand. We re-affirm that there never was a party known among the Baptists as "Old School" or Primitive Baptists till the year 1832.

We only proposed to occupy one column per week with the discussion of the claims of Baptists and Disciples. Therefore we divide some of the MESSENGER articles.

[Christian Messenger.]

It is now quite evident to all the readers of the MESSENGER that Mr. Ray is not going to affirm the doctrine and practice of his church. We have done all in our power to draw him into a square issue upon our differences. He will not draw. He knows the Missionary Baptist church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church, and that we are

able to show it, and he is not going to make issue on that question. All his bluster about there being no such church, and about our fixing up a new proposition, is mere buncombe, to escape the discussion. This is the proposition that we offered him in our first article, as every reader knows, and it is perfectly fair in every respect. He can not escape now. He must either debate or surrender. If he can not sustain the proposition, he is at liberty to call in his friend J. R. Graves to assist him. We will give them chapter about on the doctrine and practice of Missionary Baptists. Come up to the work now, gentlemen, or we shall demand an unconditional surrender.

Dr. Ray is caught in his own trap. He has been affirming for years that there is a Campbellite church, although he never saw such a church, and nobody on the earth wears that name. When we ask him to affirm the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church, he tries to get out of it by denying the name. But have we not much better proof that there is a Missionary Baptist church than he has that there is a Campbellite church? His brethren do not deny the name; they wear it and glory in it. We see it printed in their church covenants, in the minutes of their associations, and in their newspapers. Not long since a prominent minister printed it "Missionary Baptist church of Christ." He was told by a Christian that if he would cut off the head and neck of that name, he would have a scriptural title. Yes, sir, there are Missionary Baptists in Texas and Missouri, and Mr. Ray's readers know it, if he does not, and it is for them we write. They are not so totally depraved as to deny facts and history. We would to God that there were no Missionary Baptists, or any other Baptists, but that all of them were Christians, as they ought to be. But if there is nothing in a name, and if God's church is a nameless organization, as Mr. Ray affirms, why does he object to the name Missionary Baptists? It is just as scriptural as any of the names worn by Baptists. There are some ten Baptist bodies in the United States, viz: Particular Baptists, General Baptists, (Old and New Connection), Scotch Baptists, Regular Baptists, Free-Will Baptists, Seventh-Day Baptists, Two-Seed Baptists, Missionary Baptists, etc. Dr. Ray does not belong to all these organizations. And his claim that he is just a Baptist is too indefinite. It may be that he does not know what kind of a Baptist he is, but most of our readers will take it that he knows, but is afraid to tell. We are prepared to show that not one of the Baptist bodies is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church. If he will take a stand with the old primitive body that existed in the days of A. Campbell, (and he

seems to have a leaning that way,) then we will show that its doctrine of unconditional election, particular redemption and irresistible grace are not apostolic. Just let our friend plant himself here, if he desires a debate. He will not do it. He prefers to discuss his intangible thing called "church claims," and let the doctrine go. What are the claims worth, if the doctrine is not apostolic? All these Baptist bodies 'claim' to be churches of Christ, but we have shown that Christ never founded one of them. Has Mr. Ray found any of them in the New Testament? He 'claimed' to have found a Baptist church on the banks of the Jordan, but when we showed that Beelzebub had a better 'claim' than he had, he fled into the wilderness with his "sheep's church," and has not been near the New Testament since! He prefers the name Baptist to that of Missionary, because he can trace it three hundred years nearer the apostles. But he loses this name fifteen hundred years before he reaches Jerusalem, and is in the same condition the Missionaries were fifty years ago—lost in the fog of Babylon! The Missionaries lack eighteen hundred years of connecting with Jerusalem, and the Baptists (all Baptists) lack fifteen hundred years of connecting. If Dr. Ray thinks he can bridge over this long period, let him set himself to work. A man who has written a book on Baptist Succession ought to be able to succeed. But we tell him he can not do it. There was not a Baptist church on earth till the sixteenth century. Six presidents of Baptist theological colleges in the United States assert that Baptist succession can not be made out. Mr. Ray admits that it can not, unless we trace through churches that did not wear the name Baptist. The name being lost, the succession is no longer Baptist, but Waldensian and Christian. To call churches Baptist churches that did not wear the name Baptist is too foolish for anybody but lunatics. As well try to trace American succession from Julius Cesar, and call it American succession all the way, as to try to trace Baptist succession from the apostles to the present day. Have we not called in vain upon Dr. Ray to find one Baptist church on earth to-day that does not wear the name Baptist? There are no such churches, and there were none in the past ages. Our friend will not have the name Missionary in the nineteenth century, and he CAN NOT have the name Baptist prior to the sixteenth century, and he can not make out his line of succession, and so he is in a bad fix. He ought to repent of his wickedness and come back to the Bible.

His statement that Eld. Trott, a primitive Baptist, admitted that his church took the name Old-School Baptists does not help

him any. Why this name Old-School? Was it not because there was a new school—a modern sprout? Which one of these schools holds the creed and doctrine of the old church? Does Mr. Ray's church believe in unconditional election and partial redemption, as taught in the old Philadelphia Confession of Faith? A primitive Baptist recently stated to the writer that the Missionaries never claimed to be the original church until they became the larger body. Now the branch bears the tree!

Our friend says he is discussing the differences between Baptists and the disciples of A. Campbell, but the reader knows that no such proposition has been proposed or accepted. We are not a disciple of A. Campbell, and care nothing for his claims or doctrine. We are now showing that the Missionary Baptist church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church. When Mr. Ray surrenders on this proposition, we shall be ready to consider any new question that may be introduced. His statement that "the church of which A. Campbell was the head and founder is no more the church of Christ than A. Campbell is Jesus Christ" is true. A. Campbell was not the head and founder of any church. Mr. Ray is so crazy on Campbellism that he runs flatly over facts, history, truth and common sense. If A. Campbell had founded a church, it would be as unscriptural a body as the Baptist church, and we would oppose it as much. Christ never authorized the establishment of a Baptist church or a Campbellite church.

He says he has answered all the silly twaddle about the name. All the silly twaddle that we have seen in this discussion about the name was Mr. Ray's attempt to show that 'Baptist church' was a scriptural name. He fell so far behind Beelzebub and the Methodists in that attempt that we think he will hardly twaddle about it any more. We have shown by irresistible irrefragable proof that the name we wear is a scriptural one, and that in this respect we are identical with the apostolic church, while the Baptists are not. This is scriptural twaddle, and is very annoying to our friend, and he would like to twaddle out of it somehow.

He says the Campbellite church endorses all the heresies of fifteen centuries. There are some heresies it does not endorse. It does not endorse the heresies of the Baptist church, viz: Wearing an unscriptural name, having a human creed, confessing feelings instead of faith, relating experiences and dreams as a qualification for baptism, using the Methodist confessional, (the mourning-bench), and reversing the Savior's commission and Peter's sermon so as to have remission of sins and salvation

before baptism! But as there was no Baptist church for fifteen centuries, these can hardly be called the heresies of fifteen centuries. They are modern inventions, like Mr. Ray's church. The mourning-bench and confession of feelings are not one hundred years old.

But he says that A. Campbell said that "every sort of doctrine had been preached by almost all sorts of preachers under the broad banner of the reformation," and Thos. Campbell said there were contentions and strifes. This was true when it was written. In the early age of the reformation the preachers' eyes were full of the fog of Babylon, and they did not see the truth very clearly. They had just escaped from the smoke and darkness of the Baptist church, and were very ignorant of Bible teaching. It is not so now. We stand a unit on the gospel plan of salvation to-day. There is perhaps more bickering among the Baptists of Texas and Missouri than among all the eight hundred thousand disciples of Christ in America. Only" recently at Dallas, Texas, a Baptist church excluded some members, and the "General Association" (which is an unscriptural body) sat right down on the church, and crushed the life out of it, and decided that the excluded members were the church! And it is among Mr. Ray's Missionaries that they have "all sorts of doctrine by all sorts of preachers." Eld. Jarrel says that regeneration precedes faith and repentance, while Eld. Lee says that faith and repentance are conditions of regeneration. Eld. Jarrel says that election causes faith, while Eld. Lee says faith causes election. Eld. Buckner is on the fence, and says he believes both doctrines! Will Dr. Ray please tell us which of these contradictory doctrines is identical with the apostolic doctrine? Is a man elected because he believes, or does he believe because he is elected? The Missionary church is squarely on both sides of this question, and can not be identical with the apostolic church.

He says we make a great ado over the name of Christ. Certainly we do. Our Bible teaches that there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved. It teaches that it is the "worthy name" by which the people of God were called in the apostolic age. It teaches that THROUGH HIS NAME whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. Certainly we make a great ado over the name of Christ, and that is why we are identical with the ancient Christians and why Mr. Ray is not. He makes no ado over the name of Christ. His ado is over the name of John the Baptist. He will not wear the name of the Master.

But our friend has discovered that in the last days seven

women shall take hold of one man, and he concludes that the Campbellite church is one (or all) of the women. Dr. Ray is about as poor an interpreter as he is a debater. If a woman is the symbol of a church, then seven women symbolize seven churches. Where are the other six? We can take this figure and make a far better thing out of it than the doctor has done. The seven women represent seven false churches—human organizations that are not found in the Bible. Their own bread, which they eat, is their sectarian doctrine which they feed upon, in preference to the bread of life that is found in the Scriptures. When we reproach them for their humanisms, they take hold of Christ just enough to claim to be Christians and churches of Christ. There are seven of these human organizations in the world to-day, viz.: Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Catholics and the Greek church. Not one of these bodies had its origin with Christ and the apostles. Dr. Ray condemns us for trying to take away our reproach by wearing the name of Christ. He will have to condemn the apostolic church for the same thing. Does he set it down as one of the seven women? It would be better for our friend to try to take away some of the reproach of the Baptist church, by inducing it to take hold of Christ. There is nothing that so reproaches that church to-day as its unscriptural name.

The Flag divides our articles. It has to take them in broken doses. We know they are bitter to Dr. Ray and his readers, but they will have a good effect when salvation takes place. The doctor is about salivated now, we think.

[Baptist Flag.]

Yes; it is sometimes necessary to repeat, for the benefit of the Disciples, for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing. Therefore, precept must be upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little. The scriptures apply especially to Mr. Burnett. , Now, he must not go back upon his good confession in favor of Baptist succession. The *Messenger* was forced to confess that: "Christ founded his church upon the rock, and it has been there ever since." Of this same church the same *Messenger* says: "In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore, according to the *Christian Messenger*, the church founded by Christ, which has continued to the present time, was called the Baptist church in the days of Alex. Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the *Messenger* was forced to say: "With Alex. Campbell, we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his coadjutors started the reformation." The *Messenger* also

confessed that "there were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to-day, in the Baptist church—Christians." See first reply in Flag of Oct. 18, 1882.

True; and as the Baptists are the church founded by Christ on the rock, which has stood ever since, and as Baptists are true Christian witnesses, then it follows that those churches which went into the movement of which Mr. Campbell was the "head and founder" are apostate. The party which has rejected the headship of Christ, and glories in a human head, is evidently anti-christian. Mr. Burnett has admitted that Mr. Campbell was at the head of "the religious movement" with which he is identified. While the Campbellite church would usurp the name of Christ, it has Campbell for its founder. It says, "Let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach."

On our second point of identity, Mr. Burnett comes out like a man. He admits that "Baptists propose to baptize the children of God, while the Disciples propose to baptize the children of the devil." The Messenger says, "Neither Peter nor Christ contemplated the baptism of the children of God, unless persons can be the children of God before they are saved and have remission of sins." This is raw Campbellism in its native ugliness. Mr. Burnett's reference to Acts 2:38, baptism "for the remission of sins," and the command to Saul, "be baptized and wash away thy sins," does not prove his doctrine. Under John's ministry baptism was as much "for remission of sins" as on pentecost; yet in no example was pardon made to depend on baptism. Jesus said to the sinful woman pardoned, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." Luke 7:52. Also said, "Verily verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." John 5:24. See also John 3:14-18. One must be a true believer *with the heart* prior to baptism; but every one that has this heart faith possesses eternal life, and is a child of God; therefore the teaching of the Baptists is identical with the doctrine of Christ. Sins are washed away in baptism like we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in the supper. The idea that the material element water literally and physically washes the sins from the surface of the body is too bad even for a Campbellite to entertain. As we have the emblematic washing away of sins in baptism, the real soul cleansing must come first, otherwise the emblem would testify falsely. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Just so, we have the real salvation — eternal life—when we believe in Christ, and when we are baptized we have the formal declaration of salvation.

The thief on the cross was saved by grace through faith. The abominable practice of baptizing the children of the devil to make them the children of God is as far from the truth as the Romish practice of transubstantiation. We are pleased to know that many among the Campbellites do not endorse this soul blighting heresy of baptismal salvation. This doctrine says that all the pious unimmersed are the children of the devil, who must be consigned to the damnation of hell. How lovely for these Campbellites to hold open communion with the Pedobaptiste whom they regard as unpardoned children of the devil!

Mr. B. admits that "love must precede baptism." Well, John says that "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." 1 John 4:7. "This is [the manifestation of] the love of God that we keep his commandments." Mr. B. talks of "unbaptized love!" It makes no difference whether John 4:7 is rendered *begotten* or *born*. Every lover of God is born or begotten of God and *knows* God. The term begotten is not applied to an unborn child of God! Such an absurd idea is not to be found in the Bible. All that are begotten of God are born of God, and all that are born of God are begotten of God.

Mr. B. says that the Campbellites themselves "profess to love God before baptism;" and yet they are the children of the devil till baptized! We did not know that the children of the devil love God!! Well, if the disciples experience the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost before baptism would it be wrong for them to tell their experience? Yes; the Campbellites do mock the Baptists for telling their *experience* of the love of God before baptism. It is not true that the Baptists, ever, in any country, required candidates to relate a dream or vision in order to church membership. In telling of the love of God in their hearts they tell "how they feel." Love is *a. feeling, experienced*. Under the apostolic ministry, they confessed that "faith which worketh by love." Gal. 5:6. This was the confession of love to God.

By the way, we have been informed that Mr. Burnett was once a shouting Methodist, telling a Christian experience. If he was deceived and spoke falsely then, how does he know that he has not been deceived again. The idle charge, without proof, that Baptists are guilty of this, that, or the other error, amounts to nothing, except to expose the evil spirit of the false accuser.

[Christian Messenger.]

Mr. Ray is still short of material, and repeats a part of his first speech. We sympathize with him. He has so little in the Scriptures that he can use, he has to gather up every scrap out-

side that seems to offer a crumb of comfort. Our confession that the old Baptist church of A. Campbell's day (not the Missionary sprout) was a part of the kingdom, seems to trouble him greatly. He would like for us to assert that these old Baptists were not in the kingdom at all, and that Alex. Campbell was not in; then he would have some reason to say that a new church was set up. We can not accommodate him. This old body (not the Missionary sprout) was a part of the kingdom, and A. Campbell was a member of it, and was never excluded from it, but reformed the best portion of it and moved it back to the Bible. But what does our confession about this old body (of which Mr. Ray was never a member) have to do with the question at issue? We are not discussing Campbellism, or the claims of this old church, but the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church. We might confess a thousand times over that the old church of A. Campbell's day was the veritable body founded by Christ upon the rock, and that would not prove that the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church is identical with the apostolic church. He tries his best to get away from the proposition. It must be painful to the doctor's friends to see with what reluctance he comes to the doctrine and practice, and grapples with that. He knows it is unscriptural, and that he can not defend it, and he would rather discuss anything else than discuss it. Our readers have observed this from the beginning. His false statement that the people with whom we stand identified deny the headship of Christ, and that A. Campbell founded a church, adds nothing to his proposition. He knows it is false, and only uses it to fill up his lack of argument. He knows that there are no Campbellites in the world, and that A. Campbell never founded a church. The only people we know that deny the headship of Christ are those who will not wear his name, and refuse to be guided by his law. We have shown that there is a Missionary Baptist church, that it was not established by Christ and his apostles, that it can not be found in the Bible, that no such church existed on the earth till the nineteenth century, and that its doctrine and practice are not identical with the apostolic church. This settles the proposition. Whatever false statements may be made about A. Campbell and his brethren will not relieve our, friend's difficulties. He has not sustained the proposition. He has lost it by every rule of logic and common sense.

Mr. Ray makes some show of defending his position that Baptists baptize the children of God while Campbellites baptize the children of the devil. All he gains by this position is in the unfair way in which he states it. He never states the position of

an opponent correctly if he can avoid it. He has not enough Christian honesty about him to do this. He would make the impression that we baptize unbelieving, impenitent children of the devil, but he knows this is untrue. The Scriptures teach that baptism is one of the conditions of pardon, a step in regeneration, and that regeneration is not completed without it, though commenced before. A birth as well as a begetting is necessary to constitute one a child of God. The Spirit begets the sinner with the word of truth, and when he is born of water he is a child in the kingdom. A begotten (unborn) child is a monstrosity. There are no such children in the kingdom of God. Jesus says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." If there are any unbaptized children, they are not in the kingdom of God. Dr. Ray is perhaps the only man in the world that thinks a person is born when he is begotten, and begotten when he is born! Is he not a wise doctor? No wonder the Baptist divinity is sick, when it has to be practiced upon by such a botch doctor as he. We have shown that we baptize the same class of persons the apostles did, and for the same purpose—"for the remission of sins." Jesus came into the world to seek and save the lost, and he said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." If they are saved before baptism, this language has no meaning in it. An apostolic conversion makes nonsense when looked at through Baptist theology. Peter told the pentecostians to be baptized "for remission of sins." Mr. Ray says when Peter gave this command these persons were the children of God. Then Peter told converted children of God to repent and be baptized for remission of sins, for he told them to repent at the same time he told them to be baptized, and for the same purpose. Mr. Ray says the baptism was for remission of sins *in a figure*. How does he know this? Did Peter say, "Repent and receive remission of sins in reality, and then you shall be baptized and receive remission of sins *in a figure*?" If the baptism is figurative, the repentance is figurative also, for they are two conditions with which the pentecostians were to comply in order to receive remission of sins. Our friend is simply trying to figure out of a difficulty. Peter's language flatly contradicts Baptist doctrine, and must be twisted and mutilated until it suits the case. The Savior says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Ray says this is raw Campbellism, for people are saved before baptism, and he proceeds to figure on the Savior's language. He says that persons have real salvation when they believe, and a formal declaration of salvation when they are baptized. Why then did not the Savior so state? He could have said, "He that

believeth shall be saved, and afterwards have a declaration of salvation in baptism." He used no such language. Mr. Ray simply perverts the commission to suit his unscriptural doctrine. He also figures on Saul's baptism, and says Saul was a child of God before baptism, and Ananias only wished him to wash away his sins in a figure. Why then did Ananias not so state? Did he say, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins *in d figure?*" If he had required Saul to confess his feelings, or his love, and give evidence of regeneration, we might conclude that his baptism was to wash away his sins in a figure, but nothing of this kind occurred. If Saul was a child of God and had remission of sins before baptism, why did he continue mourning and praying? Why did he not take meat and receive strength and comfort before Ananias came to him? He was certainly not a 'shouting Methodist' or Baptist, else he would have done this. It is not stated that Saul's sins were on the surface of his body and were washed away by the literal element of water, and yet his sins were washed away in baptism. Dr. Ray needs instruction as to what baptism is, and what sin is. Sin is not on the surface of the body, and baptism is not to put away the filth of the flesh. We have shown that our friend's position makes raw nonsense of the language of Peter, and of Ananias and of the commission, and now we will show that it makes teetotal nonsense of the teaching of Paul. Paul told the Romans that they were "baptized into Christ." Rom. 6. If these persons were children of God before they were baptized, they were children out of Christ, for he says they were baptized into Christ. The same apostle says that IN CHRIST "we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Then they were children of God before they had redemption through his blood or the forgiveness of sins! The same apostle told the Galatians, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3. If they were children before baptism, they were children out of Christ, and before they put on Christ! The same apostle told the Colossians that they "put off the body of the sins of the flesh" when they were "buried with him in baptism." If they were children of God before baptism, they were children before they put off the body of the sins of the flesh. Surely our Baptist friends have curious children of God. Children that are not saved, have not had remission of sins, have not had their sins washed away, have not received redemption through his blood or the forgiveness of sins, are out of Christ, have not put on Christ, and have not put off the body of the sins of the flesh! This is how identical the Baptists are with apostolic doctrine!

But Mr. Ray falls back on his quotation from John: "Every one that loveth is born of God." We "have shown that John was speaking of Christians, and all Christians were baptized, and also that the love of God is the keeping of the commandments. An unbaptized love is no evidence that one is born of God. He also quotes, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life." Jesus was not speaking of faith in the abstract, faith alone, (which James says is dead,) but of a living faith which accepts Christ in a gospel sense, and does what he commands. A do-nothing faith never gave any one everlasting life. But if Dr. Ray's exposition of these texts is correct, and they teach that remission of sins takes place as soon as faith exists in the heart, and before baptism, then the Bible is a contradiction, for we have produced numerous texts that show that remission of sins, salvation and forgiveness takes place in baptism. Our exposition is correct, for it harmonizes all the scriptures. Mr. Ray's exposition is incorrect, because it makes one text contradict another, and makes nonsense out of a large portion of the Bible.

The doctor comes to the thief on the cross! The thief died before Jesus gave the last commission which says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." It has no more to do with salvation under the gospel than the saving of Moses or Abraham. When Jesus was in the world, he had power to forgive sins on the condition of faith only, or upon no condition at all; but it can not be shown that after the giving of the last commission any person was ever saved without baptism. Will Mr. Ray find a case? But this doctrine damns all the pious unimmersed! And our friend just now manifests a vast deal of sympathy for these pious unbaptized children of God. Will he let them eat with him at the Lord's table? If they are the Father's children, born into the family, why have they not the right to sit at the Father's table and eat with the rest of the children? By what authority does he exclude them? We do not practice open communion with unbaptized people, (as charged by Mr. Ray), but when one of these pious unbaptized 'children of God' sits down with us and in the honesty of his heart eats of the Lord's supper, and we do not lay violent hands on him and put him out, do we commit as great a sin as the Baptist do, who, recognizing their unbaptized neighbors as Christians, regenerate persons, children of God, yet set up a bar around the Lord's table and exclude a portion of the Lord's children from the common family feast to which all the children have an equal right? When did the apostolic churches exclude any of the saints from the supper of the Lord? Mr. Ray's theory of re-

generation is too broad, or his theory of communion is too narrow! He is inconsistent and unapostolic. There is neither open nor close communion in the church of Christ, but Christian communion, such as the apostles had. Mr. Ray gushes with sympathy for the pious unbaptized, whom he says our terrible doctrine consigns to the damnation of hell. Will he tell us how our sympathy can save them, when they do not comply with the law of salvation? It was not Alex. Campbell, but Jesus, who said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Will sympathy meet the demands of this law? • We sympathize with unbaptized people, by telling them what the Lord requires of them. Mr. Ray sympathizes with them (when it suite him) by telling them (without any scriptural authority) that they are saved, and then refuses to eat with them!

Mr. Ray says Baptists do not relate dreams as a qualification for baptism, but he admits that they confess feelings. Well, dreams are just as scriptural as feelings. When did any apostle require a convert to confess his feelings, or his love, as a qualification for baptism? But Baptists do relate dreams. At a meeting in Fannin county, Texas, which the writer attended, an old man who was a mourner related that fifteen years before he dreamed he swallowed a wagon, and the tongue lodged in his throat, and he had felt that tongue in his throat ever since, until at this meeting he got it down! The preacher and his brethren received this as evidence that the man's sins had been pardoned and voted him a fit subject for baptism, and he was baptized into the Baptist church! Another man (not in Fannin county, Texas, however,) dreamed that his wife was the prettiest woman he ever saw, and when he related it to the church, it was taken as evidence that the Lord had visited him in his dream, and he was voted into the kingdom! His dream was a delusion, for his wife was not a handsome woman, yet he was no more deluded than those who trust in their feelings. The apostolic converts never confessed feelings, related dreams, swallowed wagons, dreamed of pretty wives, or any such foolishness. They confessed their faith in Christ as the Son of God, and were baptized on this confession. We have never seen a Baptist baptized on a simple confession of faith in Christ.

Mr. Ray wishes to know whether the editor of the MESSENGER was deceived when he was a Methodist, or is he deceived now. He was deceived when a Methodist, for then he trusted in feelings and delusions, such as Mr. Ray relies upon. Now he is guided by the Scriptures.

Let us sum up. The apostolic church wore the name of Christ; the Baptist church wears the name of John the Baptist.

The apostolic church had no human creed; the Baptist church has a human creed. The apostolic church had a plurality of elders in every congregation; the Baptists have one elder to four congregations. The apostolic church believed the gospel was the power of God unto salvation; the Baptist church believes that a direct operation of the Spirit is the power unto salvation. The apostolic church believed that faith came by hearing; the Baptist church believes that faith comes by praying and mourning. The apostolic church required converts to confess their faith; the Baptist church requires converts to confess their feelings or relate an experience. The apostolic church had no mourning-bench; the Baptist church has a mourning-bench. The apostolic church told mourners to "arise and be baptized and wash away their sins;" the Baptist church tells them to continue in prayer and wait until the Lord comes down and by a direct operation of his Spirit washes away their sins. The apostolic-preachers baptized converts by the wayside, when they confessed their faith in Christ; Baptist preachers require converts to wait until they can be voted on by a church. The apostolic preachers taught Christians to give diligence to make their calling and election sure; Baptist preachers teach Christians that their calling and election is already sure, without any regard to the diligence. The apostolic preachers taught, "If ye do these things ye shall never fall;" Baptist preachers teach that it is impossible to fall. The apostolic church began at Jerusalem; the Baptist church began in the sixteenth century, and was never heard of in the world until that time, and the Missionary Baptist church began in the nineteenth century. From these and other considerations, we are forced to conclude that the Missionary Baptist church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church.

[Baptist Flag.]

Yes, we heartily affirm and defend the doctrine and practice of the church to which we belong. Though Baptist churches are missionary, Mr. Burnett knows that they are not known in history by that name. He only designs to quibble over names instead of discussing the real points of difference between Baptists and Disciples. His call for Dr. Graves is to cover defeat. Why did not Mr. B. add "Campbellite Baptists" to his list? We are not discussing the claims of these parties, but of the Baptists and Disciples. As to the Baptist succession, Mr. B. has confessed that the Baptist church is the church built by Christ, and has continued to the present time. He has surrendered this point. His denial is only self-contradiction. Let him stand

up to his own confession, like a man. We have also proved that A. Campbell was the "head and founder" of the church of the Disciples. Mr. Burnett's denial is as bad as for the child to deny its natural father. This denial argues that there is crookedness in the history of the father or child, or both.

Another point of difference has been settled in favor of the Baptists, namely; while Baptists propose to baptize the children of God, the disciples of A. Campbell propose to baptize the children of the devil. The doctrine that the baptism of the children of the devil will make Christians, is the doctrine of devils. The MESSENGER has failed to reply to our argument for the necessity of sinners mourning on account of sin. This is another point surrendered.

Another point of difference between Baptists and Disciples is that while Baptists firmly teach the Bible doctrine of seeking the Lord, the Disciples deny and repudiate this essential point. This may be seen in the fact that the Campbellites willfully and wickedly invert the Bible order of repentance and faith. In fact they reject Bible repentance in toto. While they name repentance in theory, they reject it in practice. Jesus says, repent and believe the gospel; Campbellites say, believe and repent. See Mark 1:15. They make this fatal blunder because they act upon an impenitent faith, such as wicked men and devils may possess, without repentance. Because they that come to God must "believe that he is," they mistake the belief in the existence of God for heart faith. This is the reason they propose to baptize the children of the devil, with no more, faith in degree or kind than that possessed by wicked men and devils. These deluded followers of A. Campbell have repudiated Bible repentance and substituted in its stead a *formal* reformation. Just as soon as one believes that Jesus is the Messiah, they propose to baptize such a child of Satan, and then they tell him that he is a Christian! Notwithstanding in their "form of godliness" they say "faith, repentance and baptism for remission of sins," yet they make no requirement of the seeker between faith and baptism, either of mind, soul or body. This system is totally destitute of repentance. "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." Jesus taught repentance in order to faith in Christ. See Matt. 21:32. Paul preached to Jews and Gentiles "Repentance towards God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20:21. But these *Deformers* reject the example of Jesus and Paul, and then have the impudence to say that they take the Bible as their guide! This inversion of the, Bible order of repentance and faith is the practical rejection of both. This is another point where Baptists contend for the faith once de-

livered to the saints, while the Disciples reject it. Shall we obey God or man?

[Christian Messenger.]

We did not call for Dr. Graves to cover defeat — OUR defeat — but because we desired to discuss the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church, and Dr. Ray would not discuss it. Is he ready now to enter upon the investigation? If so, we will cheerfully lay aside Dr. Graves and attend to anything he may have to offer. The debate has now continued several months, and our friend at St. Louis has touched upon but two or three points of the doctrine of his church, and these very slightly. We dislike to present such stuff as this to intelligent readers, and call it discussion.

Mr. Ray says Baptist churches are missionary, but they are not known in history by that name. Some Baptist churches are not missionary. The old primitive Baptist church of the days of A. Campbell was not missionary. It believed in the unconditional decrees. Does Dr. Ray hold with it on this point, or is he with the modern sprout? And which sprout is apostolic? No, the Missionary Baptist church is not known in history by that title, beyond the present century, for it did not exist beyond the present century. And the Baptist church (any Baptist church) is not known in history by any title prior to the sixteenth century. Will Dr. Ray tell us in what history we may read of the Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries? But we have testimony, and Baptist testimony at that, to the fact that there is a Missionary Baptist church in the world to-day. Eld. Isaac Reed, a representative debater of that church, accepted a proposition from the editor of the MESSENGER to affirm that, "The Missionary Baptist church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church." Eld. Sledge, another representative debater, did affirm in debate with T. W. Caskey, at Alvarado, Texas, that, "The Missionary Baptist church is identical in doctrine and practice with apostolic teaching." We have other proof, if it is necessary, but this is sufficient. These debaters knew there was a Missionary Baptist church, and they were willing to affirm its teaching. Mr. Ray is a member of that church, but he is afraid to endorse and defend its doctrine.

He says that to deny that Alex. Campbell is the head of the church of which we are a member is as bad as for a child to deny its natural father, and says there is crookedness somewhere. He puts this in to fill up his lack of argument. He would like to bring us down on an equality with the Baptist church. That organization is of human origin. It was not founded by Christ, or his apostles, and is unknown to the New

Testament. It tries to claim John the Baptist for its father, but we have shown that John never saw it, and that it did not exist in the world for fifteen centuries after John died. It is a poor orphan of the dark ages, and does not even know its human father! The crookedness is on the part of those who reject the headship of Christ, and will not wear his name, and slander Mr. Campbell and his brethren for criticising their crookedness. Dr. Ray knows that A. Campbell was not the founder of any church.

Our friend is very mad against Peter's doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and calls it "the doctrine of devils." He thinks Peter ought to have waited until the pentecostians received remission of sins, and were the children of God, before he commanded them to be baptized. Peter knew best. Dr. Ray ought to repent of his wickedness, and be plunged into the Mississippi river for the remission of his Baptist nonsense.

He says we failed to reply to his argument on the necessity of sinners' mourning on account of sin. No reply was needed to this. We teach that sinners ought to mourn on account of sin. But Baptists keep them mourning, while we tell penitents to "arise and be baptized," like the New Testament teachers. But he says we reject the Bible doctrine of sinners' seeking the Lord. We do not. We tell them to seek the Lord, in his own appointed way, while Baptists teach them to seek him at the mourning-bench and in the straw, where he never promised to be found. This is why so many Baptist seekers fail to find the Lord. Will Mr. Ray tell us where any apostle ever taught a sinner to seek the Lord at the mourning-bench?

But he says the Campbellites wilfully and wickedly invert the Bible order of repentance and faith. Is not Dr. Ray a fine specimen to be talking about anybody's inverting the Bible order? Who is it inverted the Lord's commission, and placed salvation before baptism, when Jesus placed it after? And who inverted Peter's sermon, and placed remission of sins before baptism, when Peter placed it after? And who is it places the resurrection before the burial? ana buries people because they are alive again? Baptists are not the people to talk about Bible order. Dr. Ray finds a few texts, having reference to the Jews, where repentance comes before faith, and concludes that this is the gospel order, although it flatly contradicts the gospel order and all the facts in the case when applied to the gentile world. The Jews, who had faith in God before Christ came, and were under a law requiring repentance, were taught to repent toward God and then believe on Christ. But where persons were not already worshipers of God, this order was never observed. Dr.

Ray can not find an instance where any one ever repented until he believed in God or believed in Christ. Some faith preceded all repentance. A man would not and could not repent until he believed something. The Jews could believe in God, and repent toward God, and then believe on Christ. This repentance toward God would precede their faith in Christ. But with the gentiles, who were not worshipers of God, the case was different. Christ was God to them. They believed in God and Christ at the same time, and their faith preceded their turning from sin, or repentance. Some impenitent Jews, as those on pentecost, believed in Christ before they repented. Peter commanded them to repent after they believed and were crying out. What made them cry out? It was not their repentance, for Peter told them to repent. It must have been their faith. They had heard and believed the gospel. This gospel the apostles preached as the power of God unto salvation—the power to induce sinners to repent. But the gospel has no power over a man until he believes it; and when he believes it, he has faith. The fatal blunder of Baptists is that they do not know what faith is. They confound faith with feeling. Paul says faith comes by hearing. It is a belief of the gospel that is heard. Baptists say faith comes by praying, and is not a belief of the gospel, but a sensation produced in the heart by the Holy Spirit. They preach Christ to sinners to induce them to repent, and pray for them to induce them to believe! They say that preaching Christ can not produce faith, until one has repented. Then why preach Christ to impenitent sinners? Why not preach repentance first, and when sinners have repented, then preach Christ in order that they may believe? Then repentance and faith will come in the Baptist order. But Baptist preachers always preach Christ first, when they hold a meeting—in order, we suppose, to induce sinners to repent. But how can preaching Christ induce sinners to repent, unless they believe in Christ who is preached? Is an unbelieved gospel a power unto repentance? Dr. Ray should square his preaching by his doctrine, and not hold one thing and practice another. We would like to have a definition of faith from him—that faith which does not come by hearing, but by praying, and after repentance. Is it a belief in feelings? We have shown that Christian faith is a belief of the gospel, a belief in Christ with all the heart, but Dr. Ray says this is devils' faith, because it is not preceded by repentance. He has found a new faith, unknown to the New Testament. The faith which we have is the faith which the early Christians had, the faith which the eunuch had, the faith which the signs were written to produce, and we defy the gen-

tleman to find any other kind of Christian faith. He says faith which is not preceded by repentance is an impenitent faith. Yes, and repentance which is not preceded by faith is a faithless repentance ! And Paul says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Mr. Ray's faithless repentance is sin. He ought not to talk any more about the Methodists baptizing faithless infants. He has faithless adult men and women repenting of their sins and praying for pardon! Methodists perform the outward formal ceremony without faith; Baptists perform the inward heart-work of repentance and prayer without faith! Which is the more consistent? Only think of a whole altar full of Baptist penitents praying and crying for mercy, and no faith! But he may say that mourners have faith in God, though no faith in Christ. We defy him to find a single mourner who has faith in God who has not also faith in Christ! When our friend has disposed of these points, we have others for him.

It is another one of Mr. Kay's gratuitous slanders, that the people he stigmatizes as Campbellites reject Bible repentance altogether. Do they not present as good fruits of repentance as the Baptists ? Which one of their editors takes such delight in publishing known slanders of religious people as the editor of the *American Baptist Flag*? We have yet to learn that it is a mark of internal sanctity or of Bible repentance that a man shall misrepresent the views of his neighbors and stigmatize them with nicknames, as Mr. Ray has done in quite every article he has penned in this discussion. When he learns what Bible repentance is, he will do better.

[Baptist Flag.]

As Mr. Burnett deals in wild and contradictory assertions, instead of arguments, but little reply is needed. All the repeated bluster of the *Messenger* against the Baptists is set aside by its own testimony: "That Christ founded his church upon the Rock, and it has been there ever since." Of this same church the same *Messenger* says: "In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore according to the *Christian Messenger* the church founded by Christ which has continued to the present time, was called the Baptist church in the days of Alex. Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the *Messenger* was forced to say: "With Alex. Campbell, we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his co-adjutors started the reformation." The *Messenger* also confessed that: "There were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to-day, in the Baptist church—Christians." See first reply in *Flag*, of Oct. 18, 1882. True, and as the Baptists are the

church founded by Christ on the Rock, which has stood ever since, and as Baptists are true Christian witnesses, then it follows that those churches which went into the "movement" of which A. Campbell was the "head and founder" are apostate.

Mr. B. says that he established the name of his church from the Bible! If he has even told the name of the church to which he belongs in this discussion we do not remember it. He has long since given up the name "Christian church." Mr. Campbell, the recognized head and founder of his church, of the name Christian, says:

"Have we any divine authority for being called Christians at (ill)? The same question may be variously propounded, as, for example, was the name Christian first given by heaven or earth, by God or man? Or was it recommended by human authority, and finally adopted by divine authority? We may fearlessly affirm, from all that has recently been written on the subject, and from all that is in the New Testament, that no person can possibly prove that it was divinely introduced or sanctioned." Mill. Har., new series, vol. 4, p. 24. "Now if the name Christian had been given in Antioch, twenty years before, by divine command, what an ungodly man Luke must have been during these twenty-one years after, and fourteen years before, in all thirty-five years, never to have called them Christians, but on the contrary way wardly and frowardly to have called them disciples all the while. Unless then we suppose this man Luke to have been a bold and daring offender against a divine revelation, it is infallibly certain that he and his companions, the apostles, did not receive the name Christian as coming from heaven, but from the rude and profan Antiochians." Mill. Har., new series, vol. 4, p. 26.

The *Messenger* complains that we do not publish all of one article at once. We only invited him to occupy one column in the *Flag* per week with the discussion of the Church Claims of Baptists and Disciples. As several other discussions have opened in our *Flag*, and we are crowded for space, we will only publish about one column of the nonsense of the MESSENGER per week. The reader will observe that Mr. B. does not answer our Bible arguments. Instead of filling his paper with assertions and bare statements, let him try to prove his church claims. Let him produce the scriptures to show that the baptism of a child of the devil will make him a child of God.

[Christian Messenger.]

We demand that Dr. Ray shall surrender the proposition, and retire from the field of controversy. He has utterly failed to defend the doctrine and practice of his church. He can not do it, and he knows he can not, and that is why he tries to discuss so many questions not under investigation. We should be

ashamed to hold doctrines and practices that we could not defend. Our columns are open to the investigation of the doctrines and practices of the Missionary Baptist church, and we invite Dr. J. R. Graves or any Baptist editor in America to occupy them in a fair and manly discussion. Dr. Ray has utterly failed, and he should retire from the arena, and let some of his abler brethren try their hand. He complains of a scarcity of space, though his paper is larger than the MESSENGER. If he has not space in the FLAG, we tender him all the space he needs in the MESSENGER.

It is not necessary that we should state for the twentieth time that we have never admitted that Christ founded the Baptist church. There was no Baptist church in the world till the sixteenth century. Christ founded HIS church upon the rock, and this church apostatized, and in the days of A. Campbell a part of it was wearing the name Baptist church. There was no Baptist church until the apostasy occurred. There are Christians in that organization, but there are Christians in the Methodist church, Mr. Ray says; shall we conclude therefore that Christ founded the Methodist church? Our admission in regard to the old Baptist church of A. Campbell's day has nothing to do with the proposition under discussion. Mr. Ray is not a member of that church, but of the modern Missionary sprout, which had no existence until 1832. It is the doctrine and practice of this modern sprout that we are discussing. The old church held to unconditional election and reprobation, and Mr. Ray does not think this doctrine is apostolic.

The lengthy quotation from A. Campbell, in regard to the name Christian, cuts no figure. His position on that question has been shown to be erroneous a hundred times, and there is not a representative writer in the reformation that agrees with him. He was just out of the fog of Baptist superstition, and it was not to be expected that he should, see everything very clearly. In his more mature age, he said the name Christian was scriptural and right. His position was not that the name Baptist was scriptural, but that the name disciples was preferable to that of Christians, and was used more frequently in the New Testament. Luke used it only a few times, but Peter called the saints Christians, and Paul and James and John all refer to it as the name worn by the disciples of Christ. When did any apostle call the disciples Baptists?

Our friend is very dull, if he has not yet learned the name of the church to which we belong. We are a Christian, and a member of the church of Christ or the church of God—the church that was founded upon the rock eighteen hundred years

ago, and has no human additions or improvements, and no sectarian or unscriptural titles. If our friend can not find that church in the Bible, he can not find the church of which Paul was a member. We have not given up the name 'Christian church,' for we have never held to that name. It is unscriptural, like Baptist church, and there is no need to wear an unscriptural title when we have a scriptural one which is just as good.

Mr. Ray says we do not answer his Bible arguments. If he will tell us what his Bible arguments are, we will attend to them. It has been quite difficult to get him to come to the Bible with his doctrine in this discussion. He has made several points, and abandoned them as soon as we brought the Scriptures to bear upon them. He tried to find the Baptist church in the Bible, by finding the name Baptist and the name church, and putting them together. But when it was shown that Beelzebub's church and infant baptism could be found in the same way, he fled from the Scriptures and concluded that Christ's church was a poor nameless orphan, unworthy of a respectable title, and might as well be called "sheep's church" as anything else. Then he made an attempt to find the mourning-bench in the Bible, by quoting two texts that were addressed to disciples, and not to sinners. He next tried to prove that as soon as a sinner loved God he was born of God; but it was shown in reply that love and faith are imperfect and worthless until they become active and obey the commandments. His fourth point was to show that the Baptists are scriptural in baptizing the children of God, or persons who have received remission of sins. It was shown in reply that they are not scriptural or apostolic, for Peter baptized persons for the remission of sins, and Paul said to the Galatians that they were baptized into Christ and put on Christ in baptism, and Ananias told Saul to wash away his sins in baptism. Mr. Ray's children of God have not had their sins washed away or remitted, and are out of Christ, and have not put on Christ. We have refuted all his so-called Bible arguments, demolished all his nonsense, let the wind out of his scattering bluster, and are now ready for some real debate, if we had an opponent.

The Missionary Baptist church is not apostolic in doctrine and practice, in that it has no eldership. The apostles "ordained them elders in every church." Acts 14:23. The Baptists ordain them one elder to four churches. The church at Ephesus had a plurality of elders. "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church." Acts 20:17. The church at Philippi had a plurality of bishops. "Paul and

Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." There is not a Baptist church in America that has "bishops and deacons." In this respect Mr. Ray's church is not apostolic.

Baptists also hold to the unconditional perseverance of the saints, while the apostles exhorted their brethren to "give diligence to make their calling and election sure." Baptists say the calling and election is sure anyhow. Peter says, "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall, for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Baptists say ye shall never fall, whether ye do the things or not, and that the entrance into the everlasting kingdom shall be ministered anyhow. Peter says: "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning; for it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them; but it is happened unto them according to the true proverb, the dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Baptists say it is impossible for those who have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ to ever be so overcome that the latter end will be worse with them than the beginning, or that the washed sow will go so deep into the mire that she will be as dirty as she was before she was washed. In this they flatly contradict Peter, and are not apostolic or scriptural.

[Baptist Flag.]

We have fully established the Bible origin of Baptists. This has been admitted by Mr. Burnett, Mr. Campbell and others. Two learned historians were appointed by the king of Holland to prepare a history of the Dutch Reformed church. These eminent men, Dr. Ypeij and J. J. Dermont, devote one chapter to the history of the Baptists, in which they say:

"We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages? Rel. En. p. 796.

The intimation that the Baptists with whom we stand identified are not the same denomination that excluded the Campbellites for heresy, is a sad example of depravity. But as Mr. Burnett was once a shouting Methodist, telling a Christian experience, and has fallen from grace, and now makes sport of such experiences, we can not expect much of him. If he was deceived so as to utter falsehood for truth then, we can not expect him to tell the truth now without scriptural regeneration.

Mr. Burnett has the cold impudence to say that he is not a Campbellite, saying, "there are no Campbellites." Mr. Clark Braden, a leading Disciple, in the *Christian* of Nov. 26, 1874, says:

"Though we are as a people all very sensitive about being called Campbellites, still I am inclined to think that many of us are, to some extent, Campbellites; and certain notions obtain among us that could very properly be called Campbellism."

Exactly so; Mr. Braden was honest enough to confess that many of the Disciples are Campbellites. And in the same article Mr. Braden says:

"In our preaching and debating we have regarded Bro. Campbell's ideas, as advanced in the *Christian Baptist*, Harbinger and other writings, as finalities. We have looked on his debate as an end of controversy. The sun of discussion rises and sets in his debates."

If Mr. Burnett should deny his father Campbell as Peter denied his Master, he could not conceal the fact that he is a real live Campbellite. His very speech betrays him. He knows it himself, if he would only confess the truth.

Mr. Burnett has admitted that the Disciples propose to baptize the children of the devil to make them children of God. But now he complains at the statement of the question. We know it hurts, but he must endure it, or abandon this doctrine of devils. Will he surrender and admit that none except the children of God should be baptized? He now says that baptism is "a step in regeneration," one condition of pardon. The Campbellites have gotten up the foolish idea of three steps in regeneration! One may take two steps — faith and repentance — in regeneration, and still be a child of the devil, till the preacher consummates the work of regeneration by baptism! According to Campbellism regeneration comes from the preacher! In his sermon at the house of Cornelius, Peter said: "To him (Christ) give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." Acts 10:43, 44. Then they spake with tongues and magnified God. "Then answered Peter, can any man forbid

water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Verse 47. The Old Testament prophets gave witness to the plan of salvation "by grace, through faith," but not one of them can be found to testify to the Romish and Campbellite plan of salvation by baptism as a condition. Will Mr. B. dare to say that these disciples, who were filled with the Holy Ghost, speaking with tongues and praising God, were still children of the devil? They had received remission of sins and the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit before baptism; but Campbellism says they were still the children of the devil! All the prophets testify against Campbellism. Mr. Burnett follows the monstrous nonsense of Mr. Campbell, which makes the water the mother of the people of God! If this is true of Campbellites, it is not true of the children of God. Children usually think more of the mother than of the father; the Disciples put more stress on the water than on the work of the Spirit. God had children before the institution of baptism. Who was their mother? Who is the mother of the devil's children? Baptism is not a birth, but a burial of one who is dead to sin. But' he that is dead is freed from sin.' Rom. 6:7. Jesus said to the woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." Luke 7:50. We have the real pardon and salvation when we believe in Christ with all the heart; then we have the emblematic washing away of sins in baptism. Mark 16:16, Acts 22:16. The notion that sins are literally washed off from the surface of the body by the water is preposterous.

[Christian Messenger.]

Our friend warms up to the work a little this week, but as usual scarcely touches the question at issue. He says he has fully established the Bible origin of Baptists. He has not been within fifteen hundred years of the Bible with the Baptists since this discussion began, and he has not been within eighteen hundred years of the Bible with the Missionary Baptists! Where has he found a Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries? Has he even tried to trace his line of succession since this debate began? Is he afraid of that line, like he is of the Baptist doctrine, when he has an opponent behind him? Where was the Baptist church in the year 1400? He gives us the statement of two Dutch Historians, Ypeij and Dermont, but what proof do they furnish us? Did they live in ancient times? They lived and wrote since the sixteenth century, and merely give their opinion of the antiquity of the Baptist church. They say the Waldenses were Baptists, but do they furnish any proof? Do they show that the Waldenses called themselves Baptists,

or that there was a Baptist church among the Waldenses before the sixteenth century? We say that Mr. Ray can not find the name Baptist church in all the Waldensian writings. If he will do it, before the sixteenth century, we will give up the controversy. Prof. Whitsitt, your scientific historian, says the Waldenses held doctrines that would debar them from fellowship with any Baptist church in this country, and history tells us that they called themselves Christians, and (like Simon Peter) baptized for the remission of sins! Dr. Ray calls this the doctrine of devils. The Waldenses baptized by dipping, and rejected infant baptism, and the Baptists did the same, and for this reason Ypeij and Dermont concluded they were the same people.

Mr. Ray says that it is an example of depravity for us to deny that the Baptists with whom he is identified are the same denomination that excluded the Campbellites. It is an example of depravity for a man to falsify history and slander his neighbors. There were no Campbellites excluded, but Alex. Campbell and his brethren reformed a portion of the old Baptist church. Mr. Ray is not identified with this church, but with the modern Missionary sprout, which is not yet fifty years old. Have we not urged in vain that he defend the doctrine of unconditional election, as held by the old church? He will not do it, for he is not a member of that church, and does not believe its doctrine.

He says Mr. Burnett was once a shouting Methodist, and told a Christian experience, but fell from grace, and now makes sport of Christian experience. Mr. Burnett never related a Christian experience while a Methodist. He was not a Christian until he obeyed the gospel, and could not relate a Christian experience. He never fell from grace, but simply accepted the grace offered in the gospel, on the gospel conditions. He does not make sport of Christian experience, but believes in it with all his heart. He makes sport of the Baptist nonsense of having poor deluded sinners relate their feelings, and call that "Christian experience!" If our experience was false, as Mr. Ray intimates, so that we can not now tell the truth about Baptists without "spiritual regeneration," then all the Baptist experiences in the world are false, for ours was the same as theirs—an experience of delusive feelings. And Mr. Ray is in a bad box, for he teaches these delusive dreams and fancies as Bible truth, when he knows there is no more Bible for them than there is for the Catholic confessional. We speak truly of the Baptists, and they know that every word we say of them is true. Mr. Ray slanders Alex. Campbell and his brethren in

every article he writes, and knows that he slanders them, and when we call his attention to the falsehoods, he goes right on and repeats them. We do not consider this a mark of "spiritual regeneration."

Mr. Ray says there are Campbellites, and quotes Clark Braden to prove it. Braden did not use the term in the sense Mr. Ray uses it, and if he had, and it were true, and we were to admit that we are Campbellites, it would simply place us on an equality with Baptists—an unscriptural body with an unscriptural name—but it would prove nothing for Mr. Ray's proposition. How can the fact that there are Campbellites in the world prove that the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church is apostolic? Why then does Mr. Ray persist in discussing something not in issue, and utterly neglect the work before him? Simply because he wants to get as far away from the doctrine and practice of his church as possible. If we were as poor a doctor of divinity as that, we would drop the D. D. from our name. We would give up the divinity, or give up the doctor! But the Baptist divinity is so sick that it is beyond the reach of the doctors, and Dr. Ray is somewhat excusable for not wishing to waste medicine upon it!

He is still calling Peter's doctrine of baptism for remission of sins "the doctrine of devils." Poor deluded man! Can he never learn the truth? Can he never see that it was Peter, and not Alex. Campbell, who said, "be baptized for the remission of sins?" He ought to repent of this blasphemy against Peter, and be plunged into the Mississippi river for the remission of his Baptist nonsense. He wishes to know if we are ready to surrender, and admit that none except the children of God shall be baptized! We are not ready to surrender the Bible truth, and accept the nonsense of D. B. Ray, which would require us to contradict Peter, and Paul, and Ananias, and the commission, and a large portion of the New Testament. No, thank you. We do not want something we can not defend by the Scriptures.

Mr. Ray says the Campbellites have gotten up the foolish idea that there are three steps in regeneration. We do not know what the Campbellites have done, for we know nothing of that people except what we learn from some crazy doctor of divinity. It is hardly probable that they got up the New Testament. That book says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Here are three conditions—faith, repentance and baptism—and salvation and remission of sins are placed after all

of them. The reason Mr. Ray thinks Campbellites "got up" these conditions, he has not yet "got up" to the New Testament, to see what is contained in that book. But he says regeneration comes, from the preacher! And he puts in exclamation points, and thinks it is terrible! Has he never read in the Scriptures where Paul says to the Corinthians, "For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel?" And where he says to the Romans, "Faith cometh by hearing," and "how shall they hear without a preacher?" Does Mr. Ray think regeneration comes without faith, without hearing and without the gospel? Then why manifest such foolishness by advancing such a foolish idea? Do not Missionary Baptists believe in human agency in carrying on the work of Christ? If not, why did they split off from the old Baptists and start the Missionary sprout? Such an idea is superlative nonsense.

He next comes to the conversion of Cornelius and his house, and wants to know if Mr. Burnett will dare say that these persons were children of the devil when they received the Holy Spirit? We thought it was a tenet of Baptist doctrine that the children of the devil had to receive the Spirit in order to become the children of God! Do not Baptists all over the land pray for God to pour out his Spirit upon the children of the devil, (their mourners,) in order that they may become the children of God? Then why should Dr. Ray criticise us for admitting that in this case, for a special purpose, and as a miracle, God should give his Spirit to unbaptized persons? It was a miracle, to convince the Jewish Christians that the gentiles were to share in the gospel, and it had to come before baptism—and there is no other case like it in the whole New Testament. The pentecostians, (Acts 2,) the Samaritans, (Acts 8,) and the Ephesians (Acts 19) all received the Spirit after baptism. How will Mr. Ray harmonize these cases with his theory that Cornelius received the Spirit in order to prepare him for baptism? Of the Samaritans it is said, "For as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Baptists do not baptize until the Spirit has fallen upon their converts. Peter said to the pentecostians, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Baptists say persons receive the gift of the Holy Ghost and remission of sins, and are then baptized. They differ from Peter. Peter could not have told the pentecostians to be baptized for the remission of sins, and then thought Cornelius received remission of sins by the Holy Ghost before baptism. So when he said, "Can any man forbid

water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" he had reference to their having been accepted of God, (though gentiles,) and not to their having received pardon by the Holy Ghost.

But Mr. Ray says all the prophets gave witness to the plan of salvation 'by grace through faith,' but not one testifies to the Romish and Campbellite plan of salvation by baptism as a condition. Then when Jesus put into his plan baptism as a condition, and said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," he went beyond the testimony of the prophets, and outside of the plan of salvation by grace through faith! And when Peter told the pentecostians to be baptized for the remission of sins, he was a Romanist and Campbellite! Can anybody but a deluded doctor of divinity fail to see the utter absurdity of such a position as this? Certainly Peter said, "To him give all the prophets witness that *through his name* whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," and that is why he "commanded them to be baptized *in the name* of the Lord," and why he commanded the pentecostians to "be baptized *in the name* of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Baptists claim to receive remission of sins before they come to the name of Christ! Can not the foggy doctor of St. Louis see that salvation may be by grace through faith, and yet on conditions required by the Savior?

He next ridicules the figure used by the Savior in his language to Nicodemus, where he says persons must be born of water. He says it makes water the mother of the people of God, (and so it does in a figure, for they are born out of it,) and he calls it 'monstrous nonsense.' We do not wonder at this, for he calls Peter's language the 'doctrine of devils.' Our opinion is that D. B. Ray is a monstrous blasphemer, and that he had better repent of his wickedness. He says baptism is not a birth, but a burial. It is both a burial and a birth. We are buried into death, and raised up or born out of the grave into the new life. And the new life comes after the burial, not before it. Baptists place the new life before the burial, and make nonsense of the figure. They have both lives on one side of the grave! while nature, reason, common sense and the Scriptures place the grave between the lives. Baptists bury the living, not the dead — the live, new, resurrected Christian man — and teach that no other kind is a fit subject for burial! They bury because the person is alive again, and not because he is dead! They place the resurrection before the burial! Is not this teetotal nonsense? Was Jesus raised to life before he was buried in Joseph's tomb, or was he not first dead, then buried, then raised up? Mr. Ray's

quotation, "He that is dead is freed from sin," does not help him, for Paul was writing to persons who were dead, buried and raised up, and his language had no reference to unburied dead persons. In this, and much more, the Baptist doctrine and practice contradicts the Scriptures, and is therefore not apostolic.

[Baptist Flag.]

Mr. Burnett knows that we did not call the language of Christ Campbellism. Jesus said, "But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Mat. 24:13. According to the Campbellite argument, no one can be saved till the end of life! While it is true that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," it is equally true that every *true believer* is a child of God, possessing everlasting life. See Jno. 5:24; 3:14-18. Jesus said to the penitent woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." Luke 7:50. But in order to escape this testimony of Jesus, in saving the sinner by grace through faith, the Campbellites say the example of Jesus in saving this woman and the thief on the cross has nothing to do "with salvation under the gospel." "When Jesus was in the world he had power to forgive sins on the condition of faith only;" but now they think that the power to forgive sins is confined to baptism! Thus, with the impudence of anti-Christ, the Campbellites deliberately exclude the Savior from his own kingdom, to make room for their new church. The *Messenger* is forced to admit that it does not advocate the same plan of salvation administered by Christ.

The Messenger is compelled to admit that sins are not literally washed from the surface of the body "by the literal element of water." Exactly so; and if sins are not literally washed away, then the Baptist position is true, that the washing away of sins in baptism is only emblematic. In baptism we are "planted together in the likeness of his death"—planted in the picture of the death of Christ. Being born of God, and putting on Christ by a public profession, are quite different things. It is one thing to be born and another to be properly clothed. Paul said: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ; and if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:26-29.

They were "all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" before they publicly put on Christ in baptism. But the Campbellites propose to baptize the children of the devil into Christ!

"The children of God by faith in Christ Jesus" are the seed of Abraham, being saved upon the same plan. Paul says:

" Even as Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture» foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. 3:6-9.

True believers being the "children of Abraham" are "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Again Paul says:

" In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. 2:11,12.

The spiritual circumcision and putting off of sins comes before the burial in baptism. This is the only plan of interpretation that will harmonize the Scriptures. Baptism is a work of righteousness which we have done; but Paul says:

"But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Tit. 3:4-6.

Salvation is by grace through faith, "not by works of righteousness which we have done." On this point Paul says:

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:8-10.

In the face of the word of God, the Campbellites contend for salvation by works of righteousness which they have done.

We do invite all the pious children of God among the pedobaptists to come to the Lord's table on the Lord's terms.

Mr. Burnett complains that we do not publish all of his articles at one time. We publish more at once than we promised. Also Mr. Burnett's case is peculiar. We must give him the physic in broken doses, hoping for a good result.

[Christian Messenger.]

In most cases the physic salivates the patient, but in this case

it has salivated the doctor! We do not wonder that Mr. Ray thinks it is a peculiar case. If he has many more such," he will abandon the practice. And this is what he ought to do, for he is a monstrous quack, and administers human nostrums not laid down in the old Jerusalem dispensatory!

Our friend says he did not call the language of Christ Campbellism. He undoubtedly did. Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Ray said to make baptism a condition of salvation was Campbellism and Romanism. We do not wonder that he is ashamed of it. Let him retract it, and repent in sackcloth and ashes. He now says that this commission means what it says, but it applies to future salvation, and not salvation from sin, like, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." He forgets that in a former article he took position that the commission refers to salvation from sin, and said that the sinner is really saved when he believes and formally saved when he is baptized! Now he applies it to eternal salvation. Well, that upsets his doctrine of unconditional final perseverance, and makes Dr. Ray a Campbellite and a Romanist! The sinner is saved from sin when he believes, but unless he is baptized he can not enter heaven! It makes the entrance into heaven conditional upon baptism, which is a worse position than Alex. Campbell ever took! But by what authority does Mr. Ray separate the two conditions in the commission, and apply one to present salvation and the other to future salvation? They are tied by the conjunctive AND, and apply to the same salvation, and if one is a condition the other is a condition also. But we are prepared to show that Dr. Ray does not believe either the commission or the text which he quotes as a parallel to it—"He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." He does not believe that salvation from sin is conditional upon faith and baptism, as the Savior states, or that future salvation is conditional upon endurance to the end. Baptist doctrine says believers shall be saved, without any regard to their endurance. Therefore Baptist doctrine is in antagonism with Christ. But he says that a "true believer" is a child of God. We would like to know if a man is a true believer who has an inactive, non-working faith? James says that faith without works is dead. Can a dead, faith make one a child of God?

He says that in order to escape the case of the woman who was saved, and the thief on the cross, Campbellites say they were not under the gospel law. And in order to escape the cases that are under the gospel law, Dr. Ray goes to the woman, and the thief! Why does he select these two special cases, and shun every case under the apostolic preaching? Simply be-

cause he knows they are unlike all the cases in the Acts of Apostles, and that there is not a conversion under the last commission that harmonizes with Baptist doctrine. We defy him to select any case since pentecost, and take his stand upon it. When the woman was saved, the last commission had not been given, which makes baptism a condition of salvation. The old Jewish law had not been taken out of the way, "nailed to the cross," and the Testator, whose last will and testament we are under, had not died, and the testament was of no force and effect. Jesus, who had power on earth to forgive sins, was above law, and could grant pardon on any condition he chose, or without any condition at all; but when he gave the law, that settled the case with us. We have no right to go behind the law, and plead some case of conversion where the person did not obey the conditions of the gospel. Mr. Ray might as well present a case of remission by the offering of a lamb upon a Jewish altar, or the healing of the blind man at Siloam, and say, "Here is a case that upsets Peter and pentecost!" Why does he not come to Jerusalem, or Samaria, or Corinth, or Philippi, or Damascus, or the eunuch, and show that these conversions were like Baptist conversions? We tell him that there is no argument in this childish quibbling that he is indulging in this debate. His Baptist friends would no doubt like to see him present something that bears upon the question. His assertion that Campbellites, with the impudence of anti-Christ, exclude Christ from his kingdom, only manifests his malice and ignorance. Anti-Christ is shown in the attempt to evade Christ's law, and say that it does not mean what it says, and set up a human system in opposition to it, and call the commission Campbellism.

He says the MESSENGER is forced to admit that sins are not washed from the surface of the body, and therefore the Baptist position is right which says the washing away of sins is only emblematic. We do not see where the 'therefore' comes in. Because sins are not washed off the surface of the, body, (and sins are not on the surface of the body,) it does not follow that there is no literal washing away of sins in baptism. Mr. Ray seems to have as little knowledge of what sin is, as he does of what baptism is. He thinks sin is something that sticks on, or in, a man somewhere, and has to be taken away by a direct application. John says sin is an act, a "transgression of the law," and the Scriptures teach that sins are washed away or remitted in baptism. If they are not, the Bible is not true, and the Baptist doctrine is correct. If the Bible is true, the Baptist doctrine is false, for they are in direct conflict on this question. Mr. Ray thinks baptism is a "putting on Christ by a public pro-

fession." Then the eunuch was not baptized, for he did not "put on Christ by a public profession," when he was baptized in the wilderness alone with Philip. Nor did the jailer "put on Christ by a public profession" at the hour of midnight when he was baptized. The 'public' was not there to witness his profession. But we are aware that these cases are not like Baptist baptisms. When Baptists baptize there must be a church present, and an "experience" related, and a vote taken! But Mr. Ray says Baptists plant in the picture of Christ's death. They do not. They spoil the picture. Christ did not live the new life until after he was buried; Baptists live it before. Christ died, was buried, then rose; Baptists die, rise, and are then buried!

He next quotes Gal. 3:26-29, and says these persons were the children of God by faith before they publicly put on Christ by baptism. Paul does not agree with Mr. Ray. He says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, FOR as many of you as have been BAPTIZED INTO CHRIST have put on Christ." If they were children of God before they were baptized, they were children *out of Christ*, and before they had put on Christ. Does Mr. Ray think any one can be a child of God out of Christ? Then how does he think we get into Christ, unless by the scriptural process here stated, by being baptized into him? The Baptist idea that persons believe into Christ, and are baptized because they are in, is a flat contradiction of the statement of Paul. Christ is our righteousness, but we are not clothed with this righteousness until we put it on, and the apostle says we put it on in baptism. Mr. Ray says he was clothed before he put on the clothes! This is another Baptist delusion. We presume that the St. Louis doctor believes that *eis* means into. If so, he must admit that persons are baptized into Christ, for Paul says, "baptized (*eis*) into Christ." If we are in before baptism, then *eis* does not mean into. The Scriptures know nothing of putting on Christ twice, once by faith and once by baptism. This is a Baptist addition to the Book.

He next advances the idea that there is a plan of salvation "by grace through faith" that is opposed to baptism. This is nonsense. The plan given the world by Christ and his apostles was the grace-through-faith plan, and it had baptism in it. Paul, who says more about grace and faith than any other writer, says we are baptized into Christ.

He next quotes Col. 2:11,12, and says the spiritual circumcision and putting off sins comes before the burial in baptism, and that this is the only plan of interpretation that will harmonize the Scriptures. It is the very plan that contradicts the

Scriptures. If sins are put off before baptism, they are put off and yet not remitted, for baptism is "for the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. They are also put off while one is out of Christ, for we are baptized into Christ. Gal. 3:26. Such absurdity is not hinted at in the passage, but the very opposite. Paul says: "Circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; (that is) buried with him in baptism, wherein (baptism) ye are also risen with him." Mr. Ray says we rise with Christ before baptism, but Paul says in baptism. A man who lives before he is buried is not buried with Christ, for Christ was not alive when he was buried, and a man who rises before burial does not rise with Christ. Baptists do not believe we rise from the watery grave to walk in newness of life, or anything else, except membership in the Baptist church.

He next says that baptism is a work of righteousness, and quotes Paul to Titus to prove that we are not saved by works of righteousness. Baptism is not a work of righteousness such as Paul had reference to, that is, OUR work, but it is the washing of regeneration referred to in the text. All respectable commentators in the whole world so hold. If it is not baptism, what is it? Are we saved by the renewing of the Holy Ghost alone, without the washing? Then what does the washing mean, and what was it put into the text for? Observe, it says we are saved by the washing AND the renewing of the Holy Ghost—two things—and not by one of them. If Paul meant that Baptism does not save us, (as a condition,) he is in conflict with Peter, who says, "baptism doth also now save us," and with Christ, who says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Is it not strange that Mr. Ray can not interpret a single passage of Scripture without contradicting other passages? The reason is, his system is contradictory all over, and in direct conflict with much of the Scriptures.

He next quotes, "By grace are ye saved," and "not of works lest any man should boast," and says Campbellites, in the face of the word of God, contend for salvation by works of righteousness which they have done. In the face of the word of God, Mr. Ray misrepresents his neighbors. He knows they do not contend for salvation by THEIR works of righteousness, but by doing what Christ commanded. Did the Savior give a plan of salvation by grace, and then put into it conditions that make it a system of works? Dr. Ray is crazy. Baptism is not our work of righteousness, but a part of the system of grace. Mr. Ray should not object to works. There is more work connected with one Baptist mourning-bench, and harder work, than in all

the system of Christ. And it is wholly a human work, for Christ never authorized it, while he did authorize and command all that we do. Baptists teach a system of works—human works at the anxious seat—and then condemn us for contending for the work instituted by Christ! Ought they not to repent of their wickedness?

Mr. Ray says he does invite all pious children of God among the pedo-baptists to come to the Lord's table on the Lord's terms. But what are the terms? Why, that they shall join the Baptist church! When did the Lord make such terms? Does he say in his Word that none of his children shall eat the Lord's supper, unless they will join the Baptist church? The Bible knows nothing about the Baptist church, or its terms of close communion. We defy Dr. Ray to find either of them in the Scriptures. In this he is also not identical with the apostolic church.

[Baptist Flag]

Mr. Burnett need not deny it; for the Disciples do practice what is known as open communion with the unimmersed, whom they regard as the children of the devil. Evidently they do this to please men rather than God. In his Quarterly for 1863, page 52, Mr. Lard says:

"In the outset of the current reformation, our motto was: 'And thus saith the Lord, for every article of our faith, a precept or a precedent for all we do.' In the light of this cherished postulate, what defense can we plead for our act, when we sit down to commune with the unimmersed?"

And on page 51 of the same Quarterly Mr. Lard, the Campbellite champion, says:

"Near the commencement of the present controversy, a question was raised as to the practice of our churches in the premises. A word on this is demanded. Our Churches in the west, I am sorry to say, without an exception known to me, permit the unimmersed to communion."

In the same article Mr. Lard remarks:

"But when I concede that there are Christians among the parties of the day, let me not be accused of concealment. I recognize no human being as a Christian who has not been immersed. Men may call this by what name they see fit, it moves me not." p. 49.

Here is the proof positive that the Campbellite church is guilty of the practice of open communion with those whom they regard as the children of the devil. Of course they do this to please the world. Such a time-serving institution can not be *the* church or a church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The

Lord's supper is not merely a Christian institution to be observed everywhere. It is strictly a church ordinance to be observed by a church in a church capacity. The Lord's table is not lying loose about over creation, but it is in the Lord's house, which is the church of the living God. In view of these facts, it is evident that the Lord's children must observe the Lord's terms in coming to the Lord's table in the Lord's house. As the Lord plainly requires his people to be buried in baptism and united with his church before they approach his table, Baptists do not feel authorized to encourage even Christians to disregard the Bible order of things established by Christ and the apostles. Therefore Baptists invite the children of God who are among the pedobaptists, and Campbellites too, to receive scriptural baptism, be added to the church, and approach the Lord's table in the Lord's appointed way. Will Mr. Burnett find an example in the Scriptures where members of different opposing church organizations mixed together in hypocritical communion at the same table? Open communion, as practiced by the Campbellites, is inconsistent, unscriptural and an abomination in the sight of God.

That outrageous yarn which says that a Baptist preacher and church received a man to membership on a dream that he had swallowed a wagon, we put in the same class with various other false charges which Mr. Burnett has made without proof against the Baptists. Well, perhaps he had as well tell a 'whopper' that nobody will believe as to make his other groundless charges. Though the Bible says, "He that hath a dream let him tell a dream," and that "old men shall dream dreams," yet Baptist churches do not require candidates to tell dreams, neither do they regard dreams as an evidence of regeneration.

Mr. Burnett confesses that he "was deceived when a Methodist, for then he trusted in feelings and delusions." This explains his sad and unfortunate case. He was a deluded hypocrite telling a false experience while a Methodist, and in becoming a Campbellite he has made bad worse. Because he in his blindness trusted to feelings and delusions he has come to the conclusion that Baptists do the same thing.

His summary of charges against the Baptists are totally without foundation. When we make an allegation against the church claims of the Disciples, we introduce the testimony of their approved authors and contrast with the Scriptures. Mr. Burnett hatches up a miserable batch of false charges against Baptists without even the shadow of proof. The reader will note this difference.

In reply to his miserable charge that the Baptist church be-

gan in the sixteenth century, we introduce Mr. Burnett's former testimony to convict himself. We force him to confess, "That Christ founded his church upon the rock, and that it has been there ever since." Of this same church the same Messenger says: In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name Baptist church." Therefore, according to the Christian Messenger, the church founded by Christ which has continued to the present time, was called the Baptist church in the days of A. Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the Messenger was forced to say: "With Alex. Campbell we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his co-adjutors started the reformation." The Messenger also confessed that, "There were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to day, in the Baptist church—Christians." See first reply in Flag of Oct. 18, 1882. True; and as the Baptists are the church founded by Christ on the rock, which has stood ever since, and as Baptists are true Christian witnesses, then it follows that those churches which went into the 'movement' of which Mr. Campbell was the "head and founder" are apostate.

[Christian Messenger.]

It is difficult to get Mr. Ray to understand our position on this question. We suppose he does not try to understand it. Some of his readers are not totally depraved, and they can understand it. Then, for the twentieth time, we reiterate, Christ never founded the Baptist church upon the rock, and there was no Baptist church in the world before the sixteenth century. Christ founded HIS church (the church of Christ) upon the rock, and in course of time it apostatized, and in the sixteenth century a part of it sectized around the name Baptist church, and that church began. Before the apostasy there was no Baptist church, and when the apostasy ceases there will again be no Baptist church. It is with no hard feelings toward our Baptist friends that we tell them their church did not exist in the world till the sixteenth century, but that we may be true to facts and history. Mr. Ray knows what we state is true, and if he were an honest man he would say so. Have we not urged him continually since this debate began to find the Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries? Has he done it? Has he even tried to do it? A man who has written a book on Baptist succession, and yet can not find a single Baptist church or even the name of his church during fifteen centuries of the Christian era! His book and his pretensions are a living falsehood.

He says we practice open communion with the unbaptized. We do not. There is no such thing as open or close commun-

ion in the church of Christ, or in the Bible. As there are Christians (baptized persons) in all the parties around us, who have a right to eat at the Lord's table, we can not set a bar around the table and exclude them. We have no such right. Nor is it our business to stop and ask every communicant if he has been baptized, or if he is really a Christian. The Book says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." Baptists say, "Let a man examine his neighbor, and so let him eat—provided he is a Baptist!" We do not invite unbaptized people to eat with us, and we do not eat at their tables. But suppose we did, what harm would there be on Mr. Ray's theory? He says they are children of God, and if they are children, they have as much right to sit at the Father's table as any other children. And it is only one child eating with another child. But he says the table is in the Lord's house, and people must come into the house before they can eat at the table. Certainly; but who informed him that the Baptist church is the Lord's house? Did the Lord have no house during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era? Here is where Mr. Ray's doctrine breaks down. He and his friends have taken the Lord's table out of the Lord's house, and carried it to their party pen, and there barred it up, and now say to the rest of the world, "Come into our little sectarian pen, and you may eat at our table!" A man must not only be a Christian, a child of God, but he must be in the party pen and have the party brand put upon him by party hands, before he can eat! And all the Baptists are not permitted to eat. One would suppose that as Mr. Ray claims to be no particular kind of a Baptist, but just a Baptist, he would eat with any kind of a Baptist. Not so. He will eat with none except those of the Missionary sprout! He will not even eat with the old primitive body, about which we made the 'confession,' and to which he claims to belong! It is a church supper, a Baptist church supper, and a Missionary Baptist church supper, with him! A man not only has to become a Christian, but a Baptist Christian and a Missionary Baptist Christian, to get at his table! We tell him now there was no such absurdity as this in the apostolic day. The apostles never excluded a part of the children of God from the Master's table, and the Scriptures know nothing of the Baptist church or its close communion. Mr. Ray says we are time servers. They sing with the Methodists, pray with them, mourn with them, shout with them, preach with them, but at eating time—ah, "You take a back seat!" But Baptists are on both sides of the question on communion. In England very few churches practice close communion. Mr. Spurgeon and his church are

not close. And as Mr. Ray is defending the doctrine and practice of Baptists, how can he defend their practice on communion when they are both open and close? Which is apostolic, Spurgeon or Ray? And also comes Dr. Graves, and says that it is contrary to the landmarks for Missionaries to commune with each other, unless they belong to the same congregation!! Dr. Ray wishes to know if we can find an example in the New Testament where opposing church organizations communed together. We can not. There were no opposing church organizations in existence at that time. There was no Baptist or Methodist church on the earth, and no party communion. Will Dr. Ray find an example where any apostolic church set the Lord's table and excluded a part of the Lord's children?

He says that story of the old man dreaming that he swallowed a wagon is an outrageous yarn, and accuses us of making false charges against the Baptists. We are not in the habit of slandering the Baptists, as Mr. Ray does the Christians. We can prove all we say. The occurrence took place near the town of Ladonia, Texas, and the old man was named Brown. The writer hereof attended the meeting, and while he did not sit close enough to hear the 'experience,' several intelligent Baptists vouched for the truth of it. They thought it an 'outrageous yarn' to be received by a church as a confession of faith in Christ. We do not say that all Baptists believe in relating dreams, but there is just as much scriptural authority for relating dreams as for experiences. In the same chapter where Dr. Ray finds that a man was received for baptism on a confession of his feelings, we will find that another was received on swallowing a wagon!

He says that we were a deluded hypocrite when a Methodist, and told a false experience. If that be true, all Baptists are deluded hypocrites and tell false experiences, for they tell what we told. They trust to feelings, and confess feelings instead of faith. It is a delusion, we admit.

He says we hatch up false charges against the Baptists. We submit to the readers of the Baptist Flag, many of whom are believed to be honest people, that every statement that has been made on our side of this discussion is strictly correct. We have not adduced a single doctrinal point against the Baptists that is not susceptible of the plainest proof. They know that our statements are true. Mr. Ray can not meet them, and therefore he tries to dodge out of them. When did the St. Louis doctor turn champion for fair statements? Shades of George Washington and his little hatchet! If we had misrepresented the Baptists as often as Mr. Ray has the Christians, we

would hang our head in shame. How many times since this discussion began has he affirmed that Alex. Campbell founded a new church, when he knows the statement is utterly false? We can meet the Baptist doctrine just as it is, and have no need to misrepresent it. Mr. Ray can not meet us in this way, hence his reckless assertions and affirmations. Poor fellow! We are sorry for him. He had better resign and let Dr. Graves try his hand.

[Baptist Flag.]

We only invited the Messenger to occupy, with us, one column per week with the discussion of the church claims of Baptists and Disciples. But Mr. Burnett finds it necessary to fill three or four columns trying to destroy the force of our arguments contained in one column. As he has a bad cause, he tries to make up in quantity what he lacks in quality. We are sorry for him. We *are* contrasting the church claims of Baptists and Campbellites. The Messenger is so timid that it is trying to avoid involving the claims of Mr. Campbell's church. He knows that it can not endure the light of investigation. Also, to deceive his readers, he puts a proposition at the head of the discussion which we did not accept. Then to divert attention from the real issues, Mr. B. fills a large part of his space quibbling over the word 'Missionary.' We have been, and are now willing to defend the Baptists, with whom we are identified, as true churches of Christ. But Mr. Burnett must defend the Disciples, with whom he is identified, as true churches of Christ, or surrender. We do not believe that he will dare the defense. He will not agree to defend his church claims. While *Missionary* has never been the historical or denominational name of Baptists, yet the *Baptists*, with whom we are identified, have been missionaries in faith and practice from the apostolic age to the present time. This we have proved in our former articles. Instead of trying to answer, Mr. B. denies, and makes his bare assertion without proof. Perhaps he thinks that a class of people that can accept a society which has A. Campbell for its "head and founder" will take his bare statements without proof.

In the year 1847 Mr. A. Campbell went to Europe, and in a letter of introduction which he bore from Henry Clay, we have the statement as follows:

"Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the United States, distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of youth, for his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable relig-

ious communities in the United States."—[Memoirs of A. Campbell by Prof. Richardson, vol. 2, page 548.

By the use of this document in England, Mr. Campbell endorsed and published himself "as the head and founder" of the religious community to which the Messenger belongs. Also Mr. Charles V. Segar, a leading Campbellite, in his life of Alex. Campbell, which stands endorsed by the Disciples, on page 25 says:

"Alexander Campbell soon became chiefly and prominently known as the recognized head of a new religious movement, the purpose of which was to restore primitive Christianity in all its simplicity and beauty. Out of this movement has grown a people, who choose to call themselves Christians or disciples, now numbering not less than five hundred thousand members in the United States."

Mr. Segar was not so ignorant or dishonest as to deny that Alex. Campbell was the *recognized head* of the new religious movement, which brought into existence the church of the Disciples. Of course we know that Mr. Campbell was not the founder of the church of Christ. But the man that does not *know* that A. Campbell was the "head and founder" of that society known as the Campbellite church is an ignoramus. In reply to the repeated false charge that the Baptists, with whom we stand identified, have a recent human origin, we republish the testimony of Mr. T. R. Burnett himself. He says:

"That Christ founded his church upon the Rock, and that it has been there ever since." Of this same church the same Messenger says: "In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore according to the Christian Messenger, the church founded by Christ which has continued to the present time was called the Baptist church in the days of Alex. Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the Messenger was forced to say: "With Alex. Campbell, we say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his co-adjutors started the reformation." The Messenger also confessed that: "There were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to-day, in the Baptist church—Christians." See first reply in Flag, of Oct. 18, 1882.

If Mr. Burnett told the truth when he said that the church called the Baptist church was the one Christ founded upon the rock, and that it has been there ever since, then he tells an untruth when he says the Baptist organization is of human origin. In which of these cases was he trying to tell the truth? He is to be pitied. After all this raving, Mr. Burnett is convinced of "the necessity of sinners mourning on account of sin." But he does not like the mourner's bench. Well, in view of his enor-

mous sins committed in this discussion, we suggest that he ought to creep under the bench, and mourn over his sins, crying, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

[Christian Messenger.]

It is not unusual for Baptist mourners, led on by ignorant preachers such as D. B. Ray, to get under the bench, and under the feet of the audience; but when we pray, we prefer to do it in an orderly and scriptural manner. Our friend is still out of material, and makes his same old speech, which has been answered a dozen times. The printers of the MESSENGER office say that if they had known Mr. Ray was going to make the same speech all the time, they could have saved a good deal of type-setting by letting it stand in type! The readers of the Flag have learned enough about Henry Clay and Chas. V. Segar, and ought to be told something about the Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries. Our friend has not come to this part of his subject yet, nor has he established the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church. He has not given us a line on the subject in his last speech! It does not matter what we said about the Baptist church of A. Campbell's day. Mr. Ray is not a member of that church, and does not eat with it, and he will not defend its doctrine. He repudiates the name of the new sprout, and the doctrine of the old sprout, and will not defend any of the sprouts! He now says he belongs to the *Baptists*, and italicises it, to show, we presume, that he belongs to the *Italic Baptists*! Well, there were no *Italic Baptists* when the New Testament was written! He says these Baptists have been missionary from the days of the apostles to the present time. If he will show where Baptists (any Baptists) did missionary work before the sixteenth century, we will join the Baptist church. Here is a chance for our friend to do some work for his cause, and it will be a great deal better work than to go on slandering A. Campbell and saying that he founded a church. Thus far he has made no effort to show us a Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. We know he can not do it, and that is why we make the challenge so boldly. And we know that Mr. Ray knows he can not do it. All Baptist churches are apostasies from the true church, and when the apostasies cease they will cease—as Baptist churches. Christ never founded them, and not one of them is identical in doctrine with the apostolic church.

He says we occupy a good deal of space. We do not wonder at his complaint here. A man who can not fill one column per week without repeating himself as he does, is in a great strait!

But more than half we write is upon matters foreign to the proposition, which Mr. Ray has lugged into the discussion, and to correct slanders and misrepresentations. It requires more time and space to keep him to the question than to answer his arguments! The reader will also bear in mind that we have to develop both sides of the question, as Mr. Ray will not lead in the affirmative of his own church doctrine.

He says that he has not agreed to discuss the proposition which stands at the head of the debate, and that we try to deceive our readers by keeping it there. Our readers are not deceived. They have read every word that has been uttered in this discussion, on both sides, from Mr. Ray's blow and banter and tender of division of space in the beginning, to his inglorious defeat and cry for mercy, and confession that he can not defend the doctrine and practice of his church. It is the proposition we tendered him in our first article, which he copied and replied to, and all know that the debate was begun in good faith. It took our friend just three weeks to discover that he could not defend the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church, and that he had not agreed to do so! It is a little too thin. If Mr. Ray will sign the following certificate, we will withdraw the proposition and discuss something else:

" I, D. B. Ray, do admit and confess that the Missionary Baptist church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church."

These are the terms of surrender, and Mr. Ray must accept them, or let the battle go on. He says we try to avoid involving the claims of Mr. Campbell's church. We do not, Mr. Campbell has no church, and we are not a member of it, and its claims have no connection with this discussion. When Mr. Ray surrenders Missionary Baptist claims, we will then affirm any proposition involving the doctrine and practice of the church of Christ. And we promise not to dodge the issue as the valorous doctor of St. Louis has done on his proposition.

He says we think some people will take our bare statement for proof. By no means. We have no people among us who swallow down things like ignorant Baptists swallow Ray's Munchausenisms about Baptist succession. How many times in his life has he told his brethren that there were Baptist churches all the way back to the apostles? and how many times in this debate has he been called upon to show one Baptist church before the sixteenth century, and has utterly failed to do so? If we could do no better for our cause than that, our brethren would drum us out of the camp!

Thus far it has been shown that the Missionary Baptist church is not identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church on the following points:

1. It has a different name. The apostolic church was called the church of God and church of Christ, by the inspired writers, and not the Missionary Baptist church nor the Baptist church; and its members were called Christians and disciples.

2. It has a different creed. The apostolic church had no human creed, articles of faith, or church covenant, in addition to the Scriptures, as the Missionary Baptist church has.

3. It has a different organization. The apostolic church had "elders in every church." Missionary Baptist churches have no eldership. They have one elder to four churches, and never a plurality in one church.

4. It has a different language. It calls the Lord's day the Sabbath, and labels its preachers D. D.'s and LL. D.'s.

5. It teaches that faith comes by praying, and not by hearing, and that it is a sentiment or feeling wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit, and not a belief of the gospel or belief in Christ with all the heart.

6. It teaches that sinners may repent without faith, and that repentance is necessary to faith, while the apostolic church taught that whatsoever is not of faith is sin, and preached Christ to sinners in order that they might believe on him and be moved thereby to repent of their sins.

7. It teaches its converts to confess their feelings, instead of their faith, and will not baptize on a confession of faith.

8. It votes on the reception of candidates for baptism, and will not allow its ministers to baptize by the wayside, as Philip did in the desert, and as Paul and Silas did at Philippi.

9. It has a mourning-bench or Methodist confessional, which was unknown in the world until one hundred years ago.

10. It displaces baptism from its position in the Christian system, where Jesus and his apostles placed it, and reverses the commission and Peter's sermon on the day of pentecost. While baptism is admitted to be a burial, it does not occupy the place of a burial, (between the two lives,) but comes after the resurrection.

11. It observes the Lord's supper quarterly, while the apostolic church met on the first day of the week to break bread.

12. It excludes from the communion a part of the children of God, which the apostolic church did not.

13. It teaches the unconditional final perseverance of all the saints, while the apostolic church held that we must "give diligence to make our calling and election sure," and that we must

fight, and strive, and work, and labor and be faithful unto the end, if we would be saved in heaven.

In addition to the foregoing thirteen points of difference, we now add the fourteenth, which is, that the Missionary Baptist church denies the great fundamental doctrine of justification by faith! As much as has been said about faith in this discussion, we are now prepared to show that Dr. Ray does not believe the sinner is saved by faith, but that he must be saved before he can exercise faith! It has already been observed how he holds that the sinner must repent before faith, pray before faith, mourn before faith, seek the Lord before faith, and we now add that it is a tenet of Baptist doctrine that regeneration precedes faith! If our friend denies this, we are ready with the proof. The doctrine is, that the unregenerate sinner is totally depraved and dead, and unable to exercise saving faith in Christ until the Spirit by a direct operation (not through the truth) quickens him into life. Therefore, if he must be regenerated and born of the Spirit before he can have faith, he is not saved by or through faith! The Missionary Baptist church is therefore not identical with the apostolic church on the subject of justification by faith.

[Baptist Flag.]

We most emphatically charge that the Disciples are not churches of Christ, because they invert and pervert the Bible order of repentance and faith. Mr. Burnett is forced to admit that to the Jews "repentance comes before faith," but denies that this is the gospel order "when applied to the gentile world!" But he directly contradicts Paul, who preached for the space of three years at Ephesus, "testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20:21. The gospel order and plan of salvation is the same to Jews and gentiles. Of the gentiles Peter says: "God, which knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith." Acts 15:8, 9. But the Campbellites say there is a difference; that God gave one plan to the Jews and another to the gentiles. Are we to follow the Bible, or the Campbellites? Jesus preached the gospel order when he said: "Repent ye, and believe the gospel:" Mark 1:15. Paul preached to Jews and Greeks, (gentiles,) repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. But the Disciples will neither preach like Jesus nor Paul. They call this change *reformation!* It is rebellion against the Bible order. In every instance in

the entire Bible, where repentance and faith are named together, repentance stands first in point of order. There is a vast difference between the belief in the existence of God and Christ, and *heart* faith in Jesus Christ. It is absolutely impossible for the "faith which worketh by love" to dwell in the heart prior to repentance. On pentecost, though the Jews were convinced of sin—cut to the heart—they did not possess the *faith of love* before repentance. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." While true repentance and faith are correlative—inseparable—it is impossible for the heart faith of love to exist in an impenitent heart before repentance. The fatal error of Campbellism consists in the fact that it possesses a faith no better in degree or kind than may be entertained by wicked men and demons. They reject and denounce the *experience* of heart faith, in which "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given unto us."

Mr. Burnett says that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation—the power to induce sinners to repent." But Paul says that the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." He perverts the testimony of Paul. Mr. B. charges that "Baptists confound faith and feeling." Not at all. But the faith 'with the heart,' that 'worketh by love,' includes feeling. An unfeeling faith may be the belief of demons and wicked men.

The love of God—the new covenant—is written in the *mind* and in the *heart*. Heb. 8:10. This heart faith is based upon double testimony—two witnesses. Hearing the gospel attended by the Spirit, the sinner is convicted of sin, cut to the heart; and when he repents toward God, the love of God being shed abroad in his heart, he possesses the faith which worketh by love. This loving faith is based upon the combined testimony of the word and the Spirit. The Disciples say the word *alone*. Paul says, "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." 1 Thes. 1:15. But Campbellism raises its presumptuous head and says "word only! "

Baptists do teach that no one can come to God till he believes "that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." But the diligent seeking includes mourning on account of sin, and prayer for mercy. James 4:8,10. Acts 2:21.

Mr. B. has fallen from the grace of patience, and charges us with slander, because we contend that there is no repentance in Campbellism. Let him cool his head and answer the fol-

lowing: What do Disciples teach one to do between the exercise of faith and the act of baptism? Please answer. Do.

[Christian Messenger.]

We were neither hot nor impatient when we told Dr. Ray that he willfully and knowingly slandered the disciples of Christ when he said they had no repentance. We did not say it even in our haste, as David did, but coolly and deliberately. We shall not withdraw it unless he retracts the slander. The mourning-bench is not repentance, nor any proof of repentance. If so, how did people repent for seventeen hundred years before this Methodist machine was invented? Our friend now wants to know what we teach sinners to do between faith and baptism! If he were an ignorant booby, living in the backwoods, and had never read our books and newspapers or the Bible, there would be some pertinency in his question. We teach them to do what Peter told the pentecostians to do, when they believed, and what the eunuch did. We go by the Bible, and that teaches that when sinners believed the gospel they repented of their sins, confessed their faith, and were then ready for baptism.

But he says the disciples are not churches of Christ, because they invert the Bible order of repentance and faith. Then the Baptists are not churches of Christ, because they invert the Bible order of the commission! They say, "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized." But we have shown that we do not invert the Bible order, when applied to the same class of persons. Jews, who believed in God and worshiped God, and worshipping Greeks like those Paul preached to, could repent toward God and believe in Christ; but to persons who had no knowledge of God or Christ we would preach Christ and him crucified, in order that they might believe on him and be induced to repent. This is what Paul did at Corinth and elsewhere—"declared first of all (not repentance but) how that Christ died for our sins." We called upon Mr. Ray to show us a gentile in this day and time who has faith in God and has not also faith in Christ. He has not done it. Nor has he shown us a mourner who believes in God, and repents, and does not believe just as much in Christ. He has admitted that a man must believe in God before he repents, but he says this is a mere belief that God is—not heart faith. He can not find a single penitent that does not have heart faith in God, and in Christ too, as much as D. B. Ray has. Let him try it. A sinner repent and weep over his sins, under the preaching of the gospel, and no faith in his heart! Nonsense. We admit that there is a

difference between simple belief in the existence of God, and heart faith; but will this simple belief in the existence of God move a sinner to repent? Mr. Ray says it will, and that the sinner has no heart faith until after he repents. If that be so, repentance does not touch the heart! Heartless repentance, produced by a heartless faith 1

He says we have admitted that Jews could repent before faith. Not before all faith. The Jews believed in God before they repented, and some Jews (those on pentecost) believed in Christ before they repented. Faith of some kind must necessarily precede all repentance, and lead thereto. A man will not repent until he believes. Do Baptists ever repent toward Mahomet? Mr. Ray says that a man who comes to God "must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," but that this is not faith in Christ. Certainly. The Jews could come to God without faith in Christ, for they did not come by Christ; but do not Baptists come to God by Christ? How do they come by Christ without faith in Christ? Either they do not come to God by Christ, or repentance is no part of coming to God, or faith precedes repentance! Mr. Ray can take that horn of the trilemma that suits him best.

He says the plan was the same to Jews and gentiles, and quotes in proof Peter's language, "And put no difference between them and us, purifying their hearts by faith." There was no difference in the way their hearts were purified. But Paul preached "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ" to the Jews and worshipping Greeks, but when he preached to gentiles, as at Corinth, he "declared first of all how that Christ died for our sins." What did he preach this gospel for, unless it was to produce faith in them and cause them to repent? Mr. Ray says it is foolishness to preach Christ to sinners, because they cannot believe on him with the heart until after they have repented! Paul preached Christ "first of all," and said faith came by hearing, while Mr. Ray preaches repentance first, and says that faith comes by praying!

He says we change Jesus' order of repentance and faith, and call it reformation. We do not change the order at all. Mr. Ray is so ignorant of the Bible that he can see no difference in the preaching of John and Jesus to prepare the Jews for the coming reign, and the preaching of the apostles under the commission. We do not call this necessary distinction reformation. What we call reformation is teaching the Baptists to lay aside their unscriptural name and creed, dreams and visions, stop inverting the commission and Peter's sermon, and come back to the Bible. He says that in every instance where repent-

ance and faith occur together in the Bible, repentance stands first, and he makes a rule out of it. If his rule is worth anything, it teaches that remission of sins takes place after baptism, for in every instance where baptism and remission occur together in the Bible, baptism stands first. And in every instance where salvation and baptism occur together, baptism stands first. Will Mr. Ray accept this order? A doctor must take his own medicine—if it salivates him!

He says the Jews on pentecost were convinced of sin, but did not have faith in Christ until they repented. What sin were they convinced of, and how? Did they think they had sinfully crucified the Lord of glory, and yet did not believe he was the Lord of glory? Until they believed he was the Christ, they had no conviction of sin, for they thought him an impostor. Paul did not know he was a sinner, when he was persecuting the saints, until he became a believer in Christ; then his faith produced repentance and change of life. But Mr. Ray says the pentecostians did not have the "faith of love" when they cried out. We care nothing about the "faith of love," or any other Baptist mysticism about which the Bible knows nothing. They had faith in Christ, and it "worked by love," for just as soon as Peter told them what to do they "gladly received his word," and went to doing it. Mr. Ray has not yet told us what made these people cry out. It was not their repentance, for they had not yet repented. If it was not their faith that caused them to cry out, what was it? We should like for the St. Louis doctor to lay aside his bluster and nonsense, and grapple with the real difficulty in this matter. His friends would no doubt like to see some debating, and they know he does not meet our arguments at all. He quotes, "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest," (Philip's language to the eunuch,) and says faith is with the heart. Certainly. And the eunuch's heart faith was that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the pentecostians had the same faith, and had it in the heart, for they were cut to the heart by Peter's words.

He says the fatal error of Campbellites is that they have a faith that is no better in degree or kind than may be entertained by wicked men and demons, and that they reject and denounce the "experience of heart faith," in which love is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit. We do not know what Campbellites have, but the body of Christians with whom we stand identified have the same faith the ancient Christians had, both in degree and kind. They "believe with all the heart (and confess it) that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." They do not find in the Scriptures the "experience of the heart" of which

Mr. Ray speaks. It must be a dream, or feeling, or swallowing a wagon, or some other Baptist superstition. We do not reject the faith of the heart, for we all confess that before baptism. Mr. Ray simply don't know what he is talking about. If we did not have any more of the love shed in our heart than he has, and more truthful honesty, we should not accuse others of lacking it.

He says his heart faith is based on double testimony; that hearing the gospel produces conviction, (or a part of the faith,) and after the sinner has repented toward God, then the love of God is shed into his heart by the Holy Spirit, and he has heart faith. According to this, a PART of Mr. Ray's faith precedes repentance! He says it is produced by two witnesses, and all of it that comes from hearing the word precedes repentance, while that which comes from shedding the Holy Spirit in the heart succeeds repentance! This is a clear surrender. We are prepared to show that all Christian faith comes by hearing the word, and since Mr. Ray admits that all this part comes before repentance, he gives up the proposition! Paul says, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." All of Mr. Ray's faith that is like Paul's comes by hearing the word before repentance. In his confusion, he calls this faith 'conviction,' and the love in the heart he calls faith! His theory would read as follows: "So then conviction cometh by hearing, and faith cometh by the shedding of the Holy Spirit!" It will be seen, by reference to the 10th chapter of Romans, that it is heart faith which comes by hearing. Our friend has not yet given us a definition of faith, and he can not do it. We held a discussion with one of his brethren on this proposition, and through the entire debate we could get him to give no intelligent definition of faith. He did not know, and of course could not do it. Mr. Ray is in the same predicament.

"Campbellites say word only." This is an unmitigated slander, and Mr. Ray knew it when he penned it. The people whom he stigmatizes as Campbellites he well knows never say 'word only.' Why he will persist in these reckless misrepresentations is beyond our conjecture. It is proof of the deep depravity of the human heart. When a man finds he can not meet his opponent's true position, he will manufacture a false position and meet that. Mr. Ray hopes to delude ignorant Baptists of the backwoods into the idea that he is debating the question! Shame! shame!!

In the 12th chapter of John, it is stated: "Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they would not confess him, lest they should be put

out of the synagogue." Here are persons who believed on Christ, (and the same word is used that everywhere stands for faith,) yet they did not repent, for they would not confess him, and it is added that they "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." If they had repented, where would their repentance have come in? It could not come before their faith, for that had already come! Mr. Ray will never meet this case. It upsets his doctrine completely. He can not say that they did not have faith, for the Book says they did. The word *pisteuo* means to believe, as clearly as *baptizo* means to dip. If *baptizo* means to dip everywhere it occurs in the New Testament, *pisteuo* means to believe everywhere it occurs in the New Testament. These chief rulers believed; they did not repent; therefore their faith preceded and existed without repentance. Here is work for the St. Louis doctor.

[Baptist Flag.]

Mr. B. knows that we did not call the language of Christ Campbellism; but he is afflicted. We showed that Jesus teaches that the true believer possesses everlasting life; and that this faith must exist prior to baptism. Therefore, one must be a child of God, possessing spiritual life, before baptism. The true *believer is saved*. See Luke 7:50; John 5:24. Of course the true believer that is baptized shall be saved. Also, the believer that endures to the end shall be saved. But, because the true believer that is baptized, and persevering to the end, shall be saved, it does not follow that one is not saved, in the sense of pardon, prior to baptism and persevering to the end. According to the Campbellite argument, no one can be pardoned till after death! If the true believer should die without baptism, he *would* enter heaven. Baptists do not teach that "believers are saved without any regard to their endurance." When one believes with the heart, is born again, he receives the spirit of obedience, which is love to God and men. If one wilfully refuses to obey the known commands of Christ, it proves that he does not possess that "faith which works by love." Such are condemned, not for lack of baptism, but because he "hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." "He that believeth not shall be damned." It is not said that he that is not baptized shall be damned. True faith in Christ is the dividing line between the saved and the condemned. See John 4:14-18. Of course one is not a true believer while he has a disobedient heart. Make the tree good, and the fruit will be good.

We go to the case of the woman that washed the Savior's feet, and the thief on the cross, because in going to these cases we

go to Jesus, the author of the commission. No Campbellite can go to the example of Christ for their plan. Mr. Burnett says that "the Jewish law had not been taken away!" What of that? The law could not save sinners. "The law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. 3:24. Though Jesus the testator had not died, yet he had power on earth to forgive sins. He was the executor of his own will while he lived. Mr. B. thinks that the offering of a lamb gave the remission of sins under the law! It was "not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." Mr. B. says, "We defy him to select any case since pentecost, and take his stand upon it." We can find examples throughout the Bible to sustain the plan of salvation which Baptists preach. When the trembling jailer fell before Paul and Silas, and cried out: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" these faithful apostles said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." No Campbellite dares to preach like Paul and Silas. Peter said: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 20:43. We not only have the example of Jesus, but we have Paul, Silas and Peter, with all the prophets, testifying that the believer is saved and has remission of sins. These *Reformers?* reject the testimony of the Old Testament prophets, the testimony of Christ, and the above testimony of the apostles. They prate, rant and rave about uniting on the Bible, the Bible, the BIBLE! But in their rebellion and treason they reject the testimony of the entire Bible concerning the plan of salvation up to pentecost. They even reject Jesus Christ from his kingdom, and spurn his examples. The Campbellite Bible begins with the second chapter of the Acts, and consists in Mr. Campbell's false interpretation of the Acts and the Epistles. These disciples of Mr. Campbell are not churches of Christ, *because they reject the Word of God as the rule of faith and practice.* We have a sad example of this in the case of Mr. Burnett, when he coolly rejects the testimony and examples of Christ as to the plan of salvation.

[Christian Messenger.]

Dr. Ray is excited. Our constant appeal to the Bible has disturbed his equanimity. We do not wonder at this. A man who can not find his church or its doctrine in the Bible is expected to lose his temper when confronted with that old book. It is not surprising that he has labored so assiduously to shun a discussion of his church doctrine and practice in this debate, nor that our battle cry of "the Bible, the Bible, the BIBLE!"

sounds to him like rant and rave. He must cool his head. We are not done with him yet. He might have saved some of what little reputation he has for truth and honesty, by not accusing us of treason and rebellion and rejecting the plan of Christ, for he has not shown in this discussion anything that Christ commanded people to do that we do not do. Because we will not accept his unscriptural name and creed, that was not heard of in the world for fifteen hundred years after the Bible was written, and will not preach his scrap doctrine of faith alone, and practice his mourning-bench absurdity, he grows wild and says we reject the Bible as the rule of faith and practice! Is he not a fine specimen to be talking about the Bible as a rule of faith and practice? He can not find his name, his church, his mourning-bench, his experiences, his pardon before baptism, his final perseverance and much more of his unscriptural theory in the Bible. But that second chapter of Acts, where he says the Campbellite Bible begins! We know that chapter is a regular Banquo's ghost to Mr. Ray. He has lost more sleep over it than all the rest of God's Word. It upsets all the nonsense he has written in this debate, for it teaches plainly that baptism is "for the remission of sins." He would cut it out of the Bible, if he had an opportunity. A man that will befog and misrepresent the plain teaching of a plain text, would destroy the text if he had the power!

Mr. Ray still denies calling the language of Christ Campbellism. Why then does he continue it? He says it is Campbellism to make baptism a condition of salvation, yet Jesus undoubtedly did this in the commission. He said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Ray says, "He that believeth is saved, whether he is baptized or not." He contradicts the Savior, and stigmatizes his language as Campbellism. He can never get out of this. He says a true believer is saved already. But how do we know one is a true believer before he obeys the commandments? He himself makes obedience the test of faith, for he says, "If one wilfully refuses to obey the known commands of Christ, it proves that he does not possess the 'faith that works by love.'" Then as obedience is the proof of faith, how can we assert the existence of faith in the absence of the proof? Mr. Ray places his decision before his proof! James says, "Faith without works is dead, being alone." Faith is dead until it does something. A dead faith can not prove one to be a child of God, or save him. Our friend has not yet answered why he divides the commission, and applies the belief to salvation from sin and the baptism to eternal salvation? Jesus did not do this. He connected them together by the con-

junction AND, as conditions of the same salvation. Whatever faith saves from, baptism saves from. Mr. Ray divides what the Lord hath joined together, and every intelligent reader of this discussion knows why he does it. It is to save his unscriptural system! He says believers who are saved from sin by faith, if they will be baptized and persevere to the end, shall be saved in heaven. Then he makes baptism and perseverance conditions of the salvation of the elect in heaven! In his confusion he runs square over the doctrine of unconditional final perseverance! He even goes so far as to say that "Baptists do not teach that believers are saved without any regard to their endurance!" Mr. Ray is wild. His readers know that this is a tenet of Baptist doctrine. In shunning Scylla, he is wrecked on Charybdis. He tries to pervert the commission, and wrecks the Baptist doctrine! Jesus does say, (not in the commission however,) "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Baptists do not believe this statement. Mr. Ray says he believes it, but he is only a late convert, and will fall from grace as soon as he has an opportunity to dodge out of it.

He says he goes to the case of the thief and the woman, because in going to them he goes to Jesus, the author of the commission. But he knows that neither one of these parties obeyed the conditions of the commission, and he goes to them for the express reason that they did not obey the conditions. Why does he not also go to the case of the young man who came to Jesus and asked what he could do to inherit eternal life, and was told to keep the commandments of Moses, and to sell all his goods and give to the poor? Did Dr. Ray ever tell a sinner to do this? Why not go to this case as well as to the woman and the thief? They all occurred before the commission was given, and one is as much an example unto us as the others. He admits that at this time the testator had not died, (and of course his will was not in force,) but says that Jesus was the executor of his own will while on earth. Who ever heard of the acts of a man while living being taken as a rule to interpret his will after death! If a man gives me fifty dollars while alive, unconditionally, on the same principle I could go and demand the property left by him at death, although he makes a will and that will is conditional! Baptist doctors of divinity are as ignorant of law as they are of the Scriptures. He says it matters not whether Moses' law was at this time unabolished, as the law could not give life. Certainly our friend is not ignorant of the fact that persons who obeyed the law of Moses were saved? Christ did not deceive the young man, when he told him to keep the commandments and he should have treasure in heaven.

And Paul spoke truly when he said, "Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them." Persons who kept these commandments during their existence received eternal life, but not one of these commands required faith in Christ. Mr. Ray is in conflict with Paul, with Jesus, and with the commission, and he is so confused, and has the two dispensations so mixed up, that he does not know where one ended and the other commenced! He is ignorant of the fact that Paul says that it was necessary that Jesus should take away the first will that he might establish the second, and that the cases to which he refers were not under the second will!

In answer to our challenge that he select some case under the commission and take his stand upon it, he takes the case of the jailer, and says he was saved by faith, and that we will not preach like Paul and Silas. We certainly will. We tell sinners to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. But is that all the jailer did, or was told to do? Will Mr. Ray say that he was saved by faith alone? Then he was saved without repentance! Faith-alone excludes repentance as well as baptism. Because Paul, in his first instructions, told him to believe, it does not follow that he was not told to do other things when he was in a condition to do them. The record says he was baptized the same hour of the night. Was not this also a part of the plan? Paul did not forget the commission, and leave out a part, as Baptist preachers do. If the jailer was saved by faith alone, he was not saved as the pentecostians were, and there is a conflict between Paul and Peter as religious teachers. The pentecostians were told to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. Mr. Ray's scrap theology sets one apostle against another, and makes the Bible a contradiction. We now tell him that he can not explain a single conversion in Acts of Apostles, to harmonize with Baptist doctrine, without conflicting with other conversions in the same book! Let him try it. His system will not harmonize with itself, or with the Bible. Certainly no such system can be the system of Christ.

He again quotes Peter, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." But he has not met our argument, that the system of remission witnessed by the prophets had baptism in it, and that baptism is a part of the system of faith. He will never meet us here. Peter, who uses this language, also commands persons to be baptized for remission of sins. Is Peter in conflict with himself, or is Ray in conflict with Peter? Undoubtedly the latter. Certainly persons who believe in Christ

receive remission of sins *through his name*, but they have to come where the name is — in baptism. They do not meet the name before baptism. Hence, believers are commanded to be baptized *in his name* "for the remission of sins."

[Baptist Flag.]

The *Messenger* has been compelled to admit that sins are not washed from the surface of the body by the baptismal water; and yet it contends that there is a "literal washing away of sins in baptism!" If this be true, then the literal water *literally* washes the soul from pollution, in baptism. The material element water *literally* washes and purifies the immaterial spirit! *Nonsense!* Yes, sin, moral pollution, sticks in a man somewhere. The fatal error of Campbellism is the denial of the corruption, which sticks in a sinner. The Disciples think that sins are confined to outward acts of transgression. While it is true that sin is the "transgression of the law," it is also true that sin exists prior to the *act* of sin. God's law lays its grasp upon the heart—demands heart obedience. The fountain of sin must be cleansed. Jesus says:

"For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness, all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." Mark 7:21-23.

All these devilish transgressions exist *within* the man before they come out. "Unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." Titus 1:15. The sin sticks in them. Therefore it requires the "blood of Christ" to "purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Heb. 9:18. This conscience and heart *cleansing* is accomplished "through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1:2. The water of baptism can not literally *wash* and *cleans*e the heart and conscience from guilt. Speaking of the disciples who had been spiritually defiled, Paul says: "But ye are washed, ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God." 1 Cor. 6:11. This *washing* and *cleansing* from the *defilement* of heart and conscience is not literally accomplished by the water. Though baptism is undoubtedly included in "works of righteousness which we have done," yet this spiritual washing and salvation is "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Titus 3:5. Surely a human

society that contradicts the Word of God by denying that sin dwells in the unrenewed heart, can not be the church of Christ. As we eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ emblematically in the supper, so we only wash away sins *emblematically* in baptism. Mr. Campbell was about correct when he said: "The water of baptism, then *formally* washes away our sins. Paul's sins were *really pardoned* when he believed, yet he had no solemn *pledge* of the fact, no *formal* acquittal, no *formal* purgation of his sins until he washed them away in baptism." McCalla Debate, p. 135.

All true Christians "are children of God by faith," so the putting on of Christ in baptism is not to make them the children of God. It is the open, outward, public expression of discipleship. The baptism of the eunuch and the jailer was not lone baptism. The Bible does not state the number present. Baptists often baptize when there is no church, except two or three present. Peter referred the question of baptizing the gentiles to the six brethren that were with him. Acts 10:47. The experience of the love of God in the heart is *told* when the heart faith is publicly professed. As the Disciples baptize without the faith of love, on an impenitent faith, of course they can not tell an experience of grace. Sad pity!

It is one thing to be *dead in* sins, and another to be *dead to* sin. "He that is dead (to sin) is freed from sin." Rom. 6:7. This death to sin must precede the burial with Christ in baptism. Therefore, freedom from sin must precede baptism. We are not planted into the literal death of Christ, but the "likeness of his death," in baptism. We must be *dead to*—freed from—sin, and then buried with him in baptism. But Campbellites propose to bury the children of the devil to kill them in sin! How foolish!

As we eat of Christ, the bread of life, *really* and spiritually when we truly believe *into* him, and eat his body and drink his blood *emblematically* in the Lord's supper, so we enter Christ *really* and spiritually when we truly believe *into* him, and we *formally* enter his body the church by open profession when we are baptized into him. Yes, *eis* means into, and persons are "baptized (*eis*) into Christ." But we are surprised that the Messenger does not know that we believe (*eis*) into Christ prior to baptism into Christ. Jesus, of himself, said: "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." John 3:14. The one believing (*eis auton*) into him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Also in John 8:18, He that believeth not is condemned already, "because (*pisteuken eis to onoma*) he has not believed into the name of the only begotten Son of

God." Does Mr. Burnett know what is meant by "into remission of sins," Acts 2:38? John said, "I indeed baptize you (en) in water (*eis metanoian*) into repentance." Mat. 3:11. Did he mean in order to repentance? This passage has precisely the same grammatical construction as *eis aphesin hamartioon*, "for the remission of sins," in Acts 2:38. If the *eis* here in Acts means in order to, then *eis metanoian* in Mat. 3:11 means that baptism is in order to repentance! Into repentance here evidently means upon a profession of repentance, they were baptized. Why not the baptism into remission of sins mean into the profession of remission of sins?

[Christian Messenger.]

Our friend comes up to the work right lively this week. For once, he tries to discuss the question, and does not give us a word about Henry Clay and Chas. V. Segar. We are glad to have him present some argument in defense of his system. It is poor argument, we admit, but poor argument is better than none. Hitherto the doctor's efforts have consisted mostly of bluster and smoke, and rantings about the Campbellites and other matters entirely foreign to the question.

He says the MESSENGER admits that sins are not washed from the surface of the body, and yet claims there is a literal washing away of sins in baptism, and he thinks this is very inconsistent. He even puts in an exclamation point! We have never known anybody so foolish as to think sins were on the surface of the body. Mr. Ray comes nearest to this position. He says sins are just under the surface of the body, and have to be washed out by a direct operation, and he wants a physical, feeling evidence of the fact! We admit that sins are not washed from the surface of the moon, and yet sins are washed away in baptism. The moon has as much to do with it as Mr. Ray's surface argument. Baptists admit that sins are washed away in the straw at the anxious seat, and yet they do not believe that the material element of straw washes the soul from pollution. Why then do they make this foolish charge against Christian people with regard to water cleansing the soul? There is this difference between water and the anxious seat as a place of forgiveness:" God authorized one, and man authorized the other. The Bible says that sins are washed away in baptism; it nowhere says that sins are washed away or remitted at the anxious seat. Mr. Ray admits that sin is a "transgression of tilt law," (an act.) yet he claims that it "sticks in a man somewhere." No wonder he has such wild notions of the remission of sins, when he has not yet learned what sin is. The

Scriptures teach that sin is an act. It is conceived in the heart, but is in an embryonic state until it is brought forth in an act. So righteousness is conceived in the heart, but must be brought forth and perfected in action before it is righteousness. James teaches the same, when he says that by works faith is made perfect. We do not deny the moral corruption of the heart, or think that sins are confined to outward acts. This is another one of Mr. Ray's misrepresentations. He ought to know better. We claim that it takes both soul and body to commit sin, and to perform righteousness. The first sin committed in the world was the work of both soul and body, and the penalty was attached to the overt act of the body; and in man's return to God, there is something for the soul and body to do. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mr. Ray enumerates several things, such as murder, theft, etc., which he says proceed from the heart. Certainly. But will he say that these things are of equal enormity in the heart and out of it?—out in living, perfected deeds? Does God punish men when sin is in the heart, or after they have committed overt acts? When did he apply the penalty to Adam's transgression? Will the laws of our country arrest a man for conceiving murder in his heart, if he does not execute it? Mr. Ray ought to know that crime conceived is not equal to crime committed. James says that faith (in the heart) without works is dead, and certainly a dead faith can not bring a blessing. Certainly God's law "demands heart obedience," but it just as imperatively demands body obedience; and it is to that law we have appealed throughout this discussion. It places salvation and remission of sins after baptism. Mr. Ray says that "sin sticks in the sinner," and it requires the blood of Christ to wash it out. Does he believe the literal blood of Christ was ever applied to a sinner's heart? He condemns us for thinking that the material element water can be applied to the immaterial spirit, (though we hold no such nonsense,) and yet he holds that the material blood has to be applied directly to the heart! He thinks sin is a literal substance, sticking in the blood and bones and heart, and has to be removed by a literal and direct application of the blood of Christ! This is a physical and fleshly religion! No wonder our friend needs a *feeling* and sensual evidence of remission! How shall he know his physical sins are gone out of him, unless he can feel them go? Our religion is spiritual—a system of faith, and not of flesh or feelings, and our hearts are "purified by faith," which "comes by hearing."

Mr. Ray quotes 1 Cor. 6:11, and says the heart cleansing is by the Holy Spirit. Certainly. But has our friend not yet

learned that the purification of the heart is not remission of sin? Remission of sin does not take place in the heart. Remission, pardon and justification are what God does for a man, not in a man. They follow purification of the heart. Mr. Ray does not know the difference between a change of heart and pardon or justification. He is so blinded by his physical religion that he has not learned the meaning of scriptural terms and the relation they bear to each other.

He again says we are not saved by works of righteousness, and affirms that baptism is a work of righteousness, and concludes therefore that we are not saved by baptism. Then Peter spoke falsely, for he said, "baptism doth also now save us." Either Peter told a palpable falsehood, or Mr. Ray made a palpable perversion of Scripture when he said baptism is a work of righteousness which does not save us. He has got Peter or Ray one into a palpable predicament!

He says the baptism of the eunuch and the jailer was not lone baptism, "though the Bible does not state the numbers present," and that Peter submitted the baptism of Cornelius to the six brethren who were with him! It is well that our friend can argue from what the Bible "does not state," for it is the only way he can make Baptist conversions out of these. The Bible does not state a word about the submission of Cornelius' baptism to the six brethren that were with Peter, nor about there being any one present at the eunuch's baptism. This case is not within a hundred miles of any Baptist conversion of modern times. The 'experience' is wanting, the mourning-bench is wanting, the vote of the church is wanting. The eunuch received his faith by hearing, and not by praying, and it was faith in Christ as the Son of God, and not faith in an 'experience,' and he confessed his faith, and not his feelings, and was baptized on this confession. Mr. Ray knows he would not baptize a man on such a confession, and if he should do so, he would be turned out of the Baptist church.

He says the "experience of the love of God in the heart" is *told* when the heart faith is publicly professed, but that we do not have this faith, and therefore can not tell it. If it is the Bible faith, we have it, and confess it. Mr. Ray has not yet told us what his "faith of love" is. We do not read of any such thing in the Bible. He talks in such an outlandish, unscriptural tongue that scriptural people can not understand him. But he did not get his system out of the Bible, and it can not be defended in Bible language.

He again quotes Rom. 6, "He that is dead is freed from sin," and says we must be dead (and freed from sin) before burial.

But we have shown that Paul was here speaking of persons who were dead and buried—Christians. If a person is free from sin as soon as he dies to sin and before burial, then he is free from sin before his sins are remitted, for baptism is "for the remission of sins;" and he is a Christian before he has the new life, for the resurrection life does not come before the burial. Mr. Ray says we bury the children of the devil to kill them to sin, and says, "how foolish!" It would take two or three burials to kill Mr. Ray to the sin of misrepresentation. He knows we do not bury sinners to kill them. We preach the gospel to kill them and bury them when they are dead. Baptists preach the gospel to kill them, pray for the Holy Spirit to come down and make them alive, and bury them because they are alive again! In their system the resurrection and new life precede the burial. Here would be an appropriate place to respond, "How foolish!"

Our friend might have saved his reputation for honesty by not quoting what Alex. Campbell said in the McCalla debate (when he was a Baptist) about Paul's sins being really pardoned when he believed. When Mr. Campbell was a Baptist he held to many foolish things. Mr. Ray palms this off on ignorant Baptists as the real sentiment of Alex. Campbell!

Mr. Ray says we really enter Christ when we believe into him, and formally enter him when we are baptized into him. How can we enter Christ formally after we have entered him really? Can we come out, and go in again, in order to preserve the form? And how can we enter really without the form? Can a man enter a house without some form of entry? Our friend has reversed the matter. Our mind and heart may enter into New York city, while our body is in Texas, but if we follow our mind and heart with our body, and go into New York, then we really enter into New York. A man does not go in reality where only his mind and heart go, but where his mind and heart and body all go he really goes. We can give one single text that forever upsets all Mr. Ray's Greek criticism. He says that in Jno. 3:14 the one believing (*eis auton*) into him really enters Christ, and that the *eis auton* shows this, without any overt act of baptism. We have the same identical phrase in Jno. 12:42, where the chief rulers "believed (*eis auton*) on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue, for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Did they really enter Christ? Mr. Ray says they did, for they believed (*eis auton*) into him, though they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God! Every unprejudiced person knows that these rulers

did not really enter Christ, (although they believed on him,) because their faith did not perfect itself in confession and baptism. It requires more than faith alone to take one into Christ. This case forever ruins Mr. Ray's theory and his Greek criticism.

He wishes to know if we know what is meant by "into remission of sins" in Acts 2:38, and says there is a parallel to it in Mat. 3:11, where John baptized (*eis metanoian*) into repentance. John baptized the people into that state of repentance into which he was trying to bring all the nation of Israel. But if *eis* here has a secondary meaning, and John baptized them *on* their repentance, that is no proof that the word has such meaning in Acts 2:38, for secondary meanings are always governed by the circumstances of the sentence and the subject. In fact, it is not possible to give the word in Acts any definition that will favor the Baptist theory. Mr. Ray suggests that Peter commanded the pentecostians to be baptized on a profession of repentance. But he forgets that the word "repent" in Peter's answer forestalls this definition. Peter would have hardly commanded penitent persons to repent and be baptized! The apostles did not baptize on a profession of repentance, but on a confession of faith. Baptists always worst it, when they begin to doctor Peter's language, and Dr. Ray is like all the other theological tinkers. He had better accept what Drs. Conant and Hackett and all other unprejudiced Baptist scholars say about it, viz., that Peter commanded these persons to repent and be baptized in order to the remission of sins.

[Baptist Flag.]

Mr. Burnett now confesses that while a shouting Methodist he was not a Christian, but told a 'false' experience of delusive feelings.' If he was a deluded hypocrite then, what proof is there that he is right now? Because he had a false experience, he pretends that Baptists have no better! His unfortunate contradictions condemn him. In the above he pretends that there was no "Baptist church during the first fifteen centuries." But this contradicts his former confession:

"That Christ founded his church upon the rock, and that it has been there ever since." Of this same church the same Messenger says: "In the days of Alex. Campbell it was wearing the name 'Baptist church.'" Therefore, according to the Christian Messenger, the church formed by Christ, which has continued to the present day, was called the Baptist church in the days of Alex. Campbell. It was in view of these facts that the Messenger was forced to say: "With Alex. Campbell, we

say the kingdom was with the Baptists before he and his co-adjutors started the reformation."

The Messenger also confessed that: "There were true witnesses, and there are true witnesses to-day, in the Baptist church—Christians." See first reply in Flag of Oct. 18, 1882.

We repeat this confession, because Mr. Burnett repeats his charge, which he knows to be untrue. He has confessed that the church that was wearing the name Baptist in the days of A. Campbell, was the same that Christ founded upon the rock, and "that it has been there ever since." This point of the discussion is settled.

When Mr. B. makes his charges against Baptists he does not even try to prove them. Allegations without proof amount to nothing. Baptists have been called by a variety of names, but this does not change their character. They use all the names contained in the New Testament to designate the followers of Christ.

We have already shown that the Disciples are not churches of Christ for the following reasons:

1. They, as a religious denomination, had their origin with A. Campbell, as "head and founder," in the present century.
2. The Disciples are not churches of Christ, because they propose to baptize the children of the devil to make them the children of God. Mr. Burnett admitted this to be their doctrine. They pervert the Scriptures to try to sustain this relic of Borne. We have overwhelmed the Messenger with the scriptures condemning this doctrine.
3. We have shown that the Disciples are not churches of Christ, because they have inverted and perverted the Bible order of repentance and faith, so as to discard true repentance altogether. Though he is mad against the mourner's bench, Mr. B. was forced to confess that sinners should "mourn on account of sin."
4. We have shown that the Campbellites are not churches of Christ, because they reject the plan of salvation dispensed by Jesus Christ. Mr. Burnett contends that sinners are not saved as they were when Christ was on earth! The Disciples say the kingdom was not set up till pentecost, after the ascension of Christ. They contradict the Savior where he says, "The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Lu. 16: 16. They try to expel Christ from a place in his own kingdom,

in order to make room for Mr. Campbell's reformation. Alas! Alas! Alas!

[Christian Messenger.]

Mr. Ray is again out of material, and has to repeat his first speech! He also forgets to discuss the question, and branches out upon the Disciples and Campbellites, parties that are in no wise connected with this debate! We are not a Disciple nor Campbellite, but if we were, and they could be shown to be heretics, that would not prove that the Missionary Baptist church is identical in doctrine and practice with the apostolic church. Mr. Ray is as afraid of the proposition as he would be of a rattlesnake, and he gets as far away from it as possible! This proves that the doctrine and practice of his church are not apostolic, and that he knows it! Alas! Alas! Alas!

Mr. Ray again repeats his assertion that we said Christ founded the Baptist church. We said no such thing. This is a perversion of our language. The Baptist church had no existence till the sixteenth century. Christ's church began in the beginning, and afterwards apostatized, and in the sixteenth century a part of it sectized about the name Baptist, and the Baptist church began. Not one single feature of its sect character existed in the ancient church. All the Christianity there is in it existed in the original church; all the Baptistism there is in it is a modern invention. Christ is not responsible for it, and did not originate it. We have urged Mr. Ray to find the Baptist church before the sixteenth century; we have offered to join it, if he would find it. We have challenged him to bring out his line of succession. He is as dumb as the grave in presence of the proposition! He knows there was no Baptist church on the earth until the sixteenth century, and that he is hoodwinking his readers with the profession that there is a line reaching beyond that period. Every honest historian in the Baptist ranks admits that the pretension is the merest moonshine. What do honest Baptists think of a man who will do as he does in this debate? Blow and sputter, and leave their cause with no argument and no defense! We know they would like to hear some debate, and would like to know where the Baptist church was before the sixteenth century. He says Baptists have been called by a variety of names. What were they called by during the first fifteen centuries? Let him give us one name? It is treason against Baptist principles to discard the name Baptist, and as this name was entirely discarded during the first fifteen centuries, there were no Baptists during that period! We have challenged Mr. Ray to find a Baptist church of the present day that does not wear the name. A church in

Liberty association, Ala., sent up messengers to the association bearing a letter from the "church of Christ at Temperance Oaks," and they were rejected. The plea was that "they claim to be a church of Christ, and not a Baptist church." This point of the discussion is settled.

Mr. Ray says we were a hypocrite and told a false experience, when a Methodist, but that Baptists have the genuine article. He has not shown wherein they differed. Ours was an experience of feelings, and so is theirs. We were as honest as they, and as sincerely believed it to be the work of the Holy Spirit as they. The mass of Baptists are not hypocrites, although they are deluded by this experience of feelings. They lay it aside when they are taught better. Mr. Ray is hardly a proper person to sit in judgment on other men's honesty. A man who continually slanders his neighbors, and perverts their language, and never corrects an error, should not speak of hypocrisy in other men. We were honest enough to give up our experience when we learned that it was not in accordance with the Scriptures; he holds on to his, against light and knowledge and the express teaching of the Scriptures. Sad! sad!

Although not demanded by the discussion, we shall notice what he says about the Disciples and Campbellites. 1. "A. Campbell, head and founder, present century." This is false. A. Campbell never founded any church. He taught Baptists to lay down their humanisms, and go back to the church founded by Christ eighteen hundred years ago. It was the Missionary Baptist church that began in the present century—a human organization, unknown to the New Testament. 2. "Baptize children of the devil—relic of Romanism." They baptize penitent believers "for the remission of sins," like Peter did. Mr. Ray calls this apostolic doctrine a relic of Romanism and the doctrine of devils! What blasphemy! Peter and his doctrine were in the world four hundred years before there was any Romanism, and fifteen hundred years before there was any Baptistism. 3. "Invert Bible order of repentance and faith." This is false. They teach that "without faith it is impossible to please God," and that repentance without faith would not please God, if such a thing could exist. But they think that Jews who have faith in God may repent toward God and then believe in Christ, and their repentance (toward God) precede their faith in Christ, but some faith precedes all repentance. A faithless repentance would be an abomination in the sight of God. 4. "Try to expel Christ from his kingdom." Another falsehood. Christ is the head of the kingdom. We wear his name, accept his authority, and take the plan of salvation as given in the last

commission, without any improvements or amendments. Baptists will not do this. They refuse to wear the name of Christ, will not call their church after him, denounce his commission as Romanism and the doctrine of devils, and take the thief on the cross as their model conversion! This is the way they expel Christ from their kingdom. Certainly the kingdom of God existed from the days of John, in its preparation, but does not Mr. Ray know that it was not a fully organized, fully equipped kingdom, with its laws and ordinances, at that time? There was no Lord's day, no Lord's supper, no remission of sins preached in the name of Jesus, and the church was not established. Luke says that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.*" The church that was built upon the rock, about which Mr. Ray talks so much, was not at this time built. John's ministry had ceased, and he was dead, when Jesus said, "Upon this rock I WILL BUILD my church." We venture the assertion that Mr. Ray will not tell us at what time the church was established? And especially that he will not say it existed in the days of John the Baptist! Let him try it. He will scatter all the way from the Jordan to Jerusalem, and his readers will not know where he locates it at. last! Here is a pretty point for some debating, if we had an opponent who would meet us on the issue.

[Baptist Flag.]

It has been observed by the reader that Mr. Burnett has not attempted to prove any of his charges about Baptists. We have proved, by the testimony of Anti-missionaries themselves, that they split off from the Baptists, with whom we stand connected, and assumed the name Old School. We have proved that the Baptists (that expelled the Campbellites for heresy) which Mr. Burnett has admitted composed the kingdom of God, established by Christ, are the same religious denomination with whom we are identified. He dares not attempt to introduce a witness to the contrary. The bare word of a man that used to tell a false Christian experience, which he now condemns as a delusion, is not legal testimony. As he himself, the only witness against Baptists, has contradicted himself so flatly, his testimony must be thrown out of court. We are ever ready to defend the claims of the Baptists, with whom we are associated; but Mr. Burnett will not dare to defend the Disciples, with whom he is identified, as churches of Christ. He knows better.

Baptists do not object to baptism "for remission of sins"—to wash away sins—as taught in the Bible. But when the disciples

of Campbell propose to immerse the children of the devil to wash off their sins literally, we can not endorse this doctrine of devils. Some Disciples have tried to make the impression that there is but little difference between them and Baptists. We are pleased that this point has been well defined. The Campbellites propose to baptize the child of the devil to make him a Christian! They perform the act that makes him a child of God! So, God does not regenerate the sinner, for the Campbellite preachers perform the act of regeneration themselves!! Therefore the preacher may regenerate the sinner and make him a child of God; or he may refuse, and send him to hell! According to this blasphemous, popish doctrine, the Campbellite preacher carries the keys of heaven and hell! According to this, the smitten soldier, bleeding on the field of battle or languishing in the hospital, reading the Testament, given by a mother or sister, repents of his sins, believes in Jesus Christ and lovingly trusts him for salvation, but he dies without baptism and goes to the damnation of hell, for want of a Campbellite preacher to regenerate him! The military prisoner, shut up in the dungeon, starving by degrees, cut off from all worldly hopes, cries in repentance, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and flees for refuge and lays hold of the Christian's hope, which is the anchor of the soul, but he dies without an opportunity for baptism, and lifts up his eyes in torment, because there was no Campbellite preacher to administer salvation!! The Disciples put salvation after baptism. But Baptists believe and teach the doctrine of Christ, where he said to the weeping woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace," and to the thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Campbellism contradicts Jesus Christ. It is anti-Christian. 1. Every true believer hath eternal life—salvation. 2. Every one should be a true believer before baptism. 3. Therefore, every one should possess eternal life (salvation) before baptism. See John 5:24.

Of course the Corinthians were begotten through the gospel, but this gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." Rom. 1:16. Every true believer is saved. Paul and Silas said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts 16:30. This was in answer to the direct question, "What must I do to be saved?" This gospel points to Jesus for salvation, but the Campbellite gospel points to the preacher for salvation. The Disciples are anti-Christian churches, because they reject the plan of salvation by grace through faith in Christ. Jesus Christ is the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Acts 4:12. But the administrator of baptism is the name given among Camp-

bellites whereby we must be saved. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

[Christian Messenger.]

It is difficult to debate with a man who, from a lack of sense or lack of principle, continually misrepresents the positions of his opponent. This difficulty has attended us through all this discussion. Mr. Ray is about ready now to surrender, as he has left the Bible and fled to the sandy desert and to the battle-field! When Baptist preachers fail to establish their doctrine by the Scriptures, they go to the battle-field and the prison, hoping thereby to scrape up a little sympathy in the minds of the ignorant and the tender-hearted, with which to cover their defeat. Mr. Ray is an adept at the art. He not only has his soldier shot down on the field, but he finds in his pocket a Testament placed there by his mother or sister! "Poor soldier, it would be a sad thing for you to die and be damned just because you have neglected to obey the gospel of Christ till this death hour, so we Baptist doctors will (despite Christ and Campbellism) fix you up a plan of salvation that will get you through all right! and it will not only save you, but it will encourage other sinners to put off their salvation till death! We get it from the thief on the cross, and call it our system of death-bed repentance, and preach it to upset the law of Christ and Campbellism!" Does not Mr. Ray know that there is no argument in this? If a thousand soldiers were shot down on the battle-field, and were to die before they could obey the gospel, would that alter the fact that Christ placed baptism in his law of pardon, and said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved?" We are discussing a question that is to be settled by the Scriptures, and not by an appeal to sympathy or to battle-fields. Suppose the bullet that shot Mr. Ray's soldier through the leg, so that he could not be baptized, had shot him through the head and addled his brain so that he could not exercise faith, would Mr. Ray say he could be saved without faith? The cases are parallel. Faith is no more a condition of salvation than baptism. And here is where the Universalist gets his doctrine. He says it is horrible to damn a man who is shot down before he has faith, and so he gives him another chance beyond the grave! Out of sympathy, he invents a plan of salvation, contrary to the Scriptures, to save a man who does not obey the law of pardon. Mr. Ray does the same. We preach the commission of Christ, and tell sinners what it requires, and leave the exceptional cases with God. We do not quiet their fears by telling them they can be saved by a death-bed repentance, (for we do not know,) but say to them,

"Behold, to obey is better than a battlefield, and to hearken than a sandy desert!" Mr. Ray says, "The Disciples plane salvation after baptism, but Baptists believe and teach the doctrine of Christ." A mistake. Christ places salvation after baptism, and says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Baptists invert this order, and say, "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized." They do not teach the doctrine of Christ, but call it Campbellism. Our friend is right in saying that all true believers have everlasting life, but is wrong in saying that a man whose faith has not moved him to action is a true believer. "Faith without works is dead," and a dead faith does not constitute one a true believer or give him everlasting life. True faith is living and active, and it is not in this live condition until it moves<sup>1</sup> the sinner to obedience. Mr. Ray gives us a syllogism, of which we must say that the *silly* is very plain, but the *gism* is not so perceptible. 1. Every true believer has everlasting life, and salvation. 2. A man may (according to Baptist doctrine) be a true believer in this sense and have life and salvation before baptism. 3. Therefore Jesus spoke nonsense when he placed salvation after baptism! How does Mr. Ray like his silly-gism?

Mr Ray says we do not attempt to prove our charges against Baptists. We have made no charges against their doctrine and practice that are not known to be true by every reader of the Baptist Flag. We leave the subject with them, and are perfectly willing to risk it. They know that what we say about them is true. It is not our custom (as it is Mr. Ray's) to misrepresent our neighbors. He has a national reputation in this line; we have not. As to his belonging to the modern sprout, and not to the old primitive Baptist body, we gave the best of evidence. He does not believe, and will not defend, the doctrine of that old body. He does not eat with it, or affiliate with it. The Primitive Baptists of today have the creed and doctrine of the old church, and Mr. Ray has a new doctrine and a new name. He says the first organized association of *his* church in America was the Philadelphia association, and he claims to belong to this body, although he knows this association originated the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, and this creed teaches unconditional election and reprobation, and straight old angular Calvinism, which he will not defend! He even says (for buncombe) that Baptists have no creed but the Bible! This old church had a creed—a regular iron bedstead—and its existence is a living witness that the St. Louis doctor either falsifies history or is so crazy that he does not know what church he belongs to I Since the Missionaries grew to be a strong church,

they aspire to be the original body. In this instance the tail wags the dog—or tries to! But we do not care which sprout Mr. Ray belongs to—neither one of them reaches within fifteen hundred years of the apostles. If he calls for proof, we give him that of every reputable Baptist historian in the world. What does Dr. Whitsitt say? What does Dr. Tucker say? What does Dr. Lasher say? What do all your college presidents say? And to back up our assertion, we propose to join the Baptist church if our friend will find it in the world during the first fifteen centuries!

He says that some of our brethren pretend that there is very little difference between us and the Baptists, but that in this discussion he is pleased to know the issue is well defined, and there is much difference. Baptists differ from us as they differ from the New Testament. They have an unscriptural name, creed, language, organization, government, and communion, confess feelings instead of faith, have displaced baptism from its position in the Christian system and put the mourning-bench therein, preach a direct operation of the Spirit not through the truth as the power that converts, deny the doctrine of salvation through faith, and belong to a church that is unknown to the New Testament. We differ from them on all these points.

Mr. Ray says that Baptists do not object to baptism "for remission of sins," if it be allowed that sins do not literally go off in baptism. He is willing to accept baptism for remission, if there is no remission! But if there is a real remission, it is the doctrine of devils! When Peter commanded the pentecostians to be baptized for remission of sins, it must be understood that he did not mean what he said—that there was no remission promised—but that the apostle was only bilking in a figure! Is not this a ridiculous perversion of Peter's language? If Peter meant what he said, when he commanded baptism for remission of sins, he taught the doctrine of devils! but if he did not mean what he said, and there was no remission of sins, then he taught Baptist doctrine!! Mr. Ray's ridiculous perversions are doubtless from the devil.

He again charges that Campbellites baptize children of the devil, and says they regenerate the sinner, and he thinks this a terrible idea. If he had been present when Paul said he begat the Corinthians, he would have corrected him, and told him that was Campbellism! Is he so ignorant of Bible teaching as not to know that the salvation of sinners is in the hands of men? Did not Christ teach, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and then command preachers to go and preach and baptize? Did not an apostle say faith comes by hearing, and

how shall they hear without a preacher? and did not another apostle say baptism was for remission of sins, and then baptize people? Why does the man talk in this silly style if he is not clean, stark crazy? Why does Mr. Ray contend for a regeneration that is independent of all human agency, and yet preach the gospel? Why do Baptists labor in revivals for the conversion of sinners? If there is any sense in their actions, there is no sense in his arguments. Christians preach the gospel and labor for the conversion of sinners, because they are taught that they are instruments in the hands of God for the accomplishment of this work. Baptists labor for the conversion of sinners, but say the labor is of no benefit! We do not know which is the most silly, Baptist labor, Dr. Ray's arguments, or the Baptist doctrine!

Our friend intimates that we are not willing to discuss our doctrine and practice. As soon as Dr. Ray surrenders the proposition now in debate, and signs the certificate presented him, we propose to take the affirmative, and establish every point of our doctrine and practice by the Scriptures. This will not take long. But one thing at a time. Mr. Ray must either defend or surrender the Baptist doctrine. He has not yet done either. Half our arguments have been left untouched. The Baptists virtually have no champion.

[Baptist Flag.]

The Baptist doctrine teaches that the Spirit with the sword, which is the word, slays the children of the devil; and when they are *dead to sin*—"freed from sin"—they should be buried in baptism and arise to walk in the new life. While men are *dead in sins* they have no spiritual life. But, so soon as they are killed to sin—are *dead to sin*—"free from sin"—they receive spiritual life. This death to sin must take place before burial. As baptism is the first duty of one that receives spiritual life, it comes at the beginning of the Christian race. In the death of the body there is a separation between the spirit and the vile body. Men are buried because they are dead, and the separation has already taken place. In the death to sin there is a "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Col. 2:11. Then we are buried because we are dead to sin—because the spiritual circumcision and putting off of sins has already taken place. But Campbellites bury the children of the devil to kill them to sin—to give them life! This is the doctrine of devils.

The gift, or baptism, of the Holy Spirit is not identical with regeneration. The true disciples of Christ had been born of

the Spirit prior to Pentecost, but they were not baptized in the Holy Spirit till that day. Sometimes this baptismal gift of the Holy Spirit was conferred before, and sometimes after water baptism. But this baptismal gift of the Spirit was never conferred upon the children of the devil, as Mr. Burnett teaches. This baptism was received by the "servants and handmaidens" of the Lord. Acts 2:18. At the house of Cornelius those that had not received water baptism received the baptismal gift of the Holy Spirit, and they began to "speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter, can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Acts 10:46, 47. Yet in the face of God Campbellism says these were children of the devil, speaking with new tongues, and praising God! Such a church is anti-Christian.

Every one that truly believes in Jesus Christ is born of God—born of the Spirit. In the apostolic age men experienced regeneration by the Spirit when they believed, which prepared them for baptism. The same class of persons enjoyed the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, sometimes before and sometimes after water baptism. But the Holy Spirit baptism was never conferred upon the children of the devil. This is the only harmonious interpretation of the Scriptures. Peter said to these gentiles, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. But Campbellites think that "through his name" means through baptism! It was "by the name of Jesus Christ" that the lame man at the gate of the temple was healed. But according to Mr. Burnett's argument (?) it was by baptism that his "feet and ankle bones received strength." The Campbellites are afflicted with "water on the brain." Poor invalids! They think that born of water means baptism; that through the name of Christ means baptism; that "be converted" means baptism; that obeying the gospel means baptism! The man that believes in ghosts can see ghosts. We need not be surprised that such a crank as Mr. Burnett makes water the mother of the people of God! This is worse than monstrous nonsense; it is idiocy. The Campbellite preacher claims to put the children of the devil into this water mother and then deliver him out of the "womb of waters" a child of God! So the preacher becomes at the same time the father and mid-wife to this water child! Of course the fool-killer must be dead or retired from business. This stupid; crazy heresy is palmed off upon the ignorant as the ancient gospel.

[Christian Messenger.]

If the fool-killer had not died or retired from business, there would not be so many crazy doctors of divinity in the land, to ridicule the teaching of the Scriptures and call it Campbellism and the doctrine of devils. Mr. Ray forgets that his silly thrust is made at the language of Christ, and not **at** the language of Alex. Campbell. It was Jesus, and not Campbell, who said that man must be born of the water. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." If a man is born of (or out of) the water, is not water in some sense his mother? Jesus uses the figure of the natural birth to represent the spiritual birth. As a child is begotten by the father and born of the mother, and thus enters the natural life, so the sinner is begotten or quickened by the Spirit (the metaphorical father) and born out of the water into the Christian life. If Mr. Ray were not so badly afflicted with hydrophobia, he could see that this beautiful metaphor of the Savior teaches a grand and important truth about the Christian religion. We will not accuse him of having water on the brain, but it is a bad case of water on the *skull*. He is such a botch of a doctor that he supposes a child can enter life without birth, and that the birth is not necessary, or that it is born of the father alone! No wonder the Baptist divinity is sick, when it has to be practiced upon by such a quack! Every commentator of note in the world for eighteen hundred years has held that "born of water" means baptism. The Methodist Discipline, Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Episcopal creed, Catholic creed, Dr. J. E. Graves, and all reputable authorities in the Baptist church so teach. And Jesus says except a man be born of water he can not enter the kingdom of heaven.

Mr. Ray again quotes his popular text, "He that is dead is freed from sin," and says that persons live and walk in newness of life as soon as they are dead! Even before they are buried!! A man that would affirm that the resurrection precedes the burial would be put in the lunatic asylum, if he lived in Texas! That is, if he were not a Baptist doctor of divinity. Doctors of divinity are presumed to teach all kinds of nonsensical stuff. Paul, in the 6th chapter of Romans, was speaking of the dead who had been buried and raised up to the new life. When we speak of our dead friends, we do not mean that they are yet unburied. The apostle teaches that, as Christ was crucified, buried, and raised up to life, so the sinner must die, be buried, and raised up to life. Christ was not raised up from the cross, but from Joseph's grave. Baptist doctrine teaches that the sinner dies, is then raised up, and then buried. This is nonsense. It

places the resurrection before the burial! Baptists do not bury persons because they are dead, but because they are alive. And they must have evidence that they are alive! They do not ask if the person is dead to sin, but, "Do you feel like you had passed from death unto life?" Their mourners are dead to sin, but they will not bury them. But let one of these mourners give a scream or shout, indicating that he has come to life again, and they will hurry him to the burial! Is this scriptural truth, or is it monstrous nonsense? Baptism is the grave, and it occupies the place of the grave—between the two lives. Our friend repeats his unmitigated slander, that Campbellites bury people to kill them. He knows this is false, and it ought to blister his tongue every time he utters it. The gospel is preached to kill sinners, and they are buried because they are dead.

Certainly Paul says we "put off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ," but Mr. Ray stops his quotation too soon. The apostle says: "Putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him by baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him." Paul says sins are put off when we are buried with him by baptism. Baptists say they put off sins at the anxious seat, and before they are buried with him by baptism. They contradict Paul. They do not rise with Christ in baptism, for they claim that they rise before they are baptized!

Mr. Ray now admits that the baptism of the Spirit, such as Cornelius received, is not remission of sins, but something different, and he says it sometimes occurred before water baptism and sometimes after. If our friend is not ignorant of Bible teaching, he knows this case is the only instance where the Spirit was received before baptism in the whole New Testament. But if this baptism of the Spirit was not remission of sins, and had nothing to do with remission of sins, why do Baptists quote it as proof of remission of sins? It was not to give remission of sins, nor to declare remission of sins, but had another office and design, as all miracles had, and had nothing to do with baptism for remission of sins. Cornelius received it before baptism, but he did not receive remission of sins before baptism. He would not have been baptized for remission of sins, if this sign had not preceded his baptism—not that the sign was necessary to make him a proper subject of baptism, but it was necessary to convince Peter and the other Jewish Christians that the gentiles were to be baptized. If it be said that Cornelius was a good man, and not a child of the devil, before baptism, and therefore baptism is not for remission of sins, we answer that Cornelius was a good man (a devout worshiper

of God) before he heard the gospel preached. Is the gospel therefore not the power unto salvation? Cornelius prayed to God, and his prayers were heard, before he received the Spirit or heard the gospel; was he not therefore a fit subject for baptism (in a Baptist sense) before he received the Spirit? Baptists, to sustain their unscriptural theory, make utter nonsense of this conversion and other portions of the New Testament. They represent Peter as teaching on pentecost that baptism was for the remission of sins, but at the house of Cornelius it was for something else! And they slander and malign and nickname Christian people because they try to teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly. Sad! sad! Cornelius was a good man when he received the Spirit, and he was a good man before he received the Spirit, but he was not saved in the gospel sense until he heard the gospel and obeyed it.

He again quotes Peter, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins," and says Campbellites believe "through his name" means through baptism. This is about as good as could be expected of the cranky St. Louis doctor. Remission of sins is received through the name of Christ, in baptism, but through the name does not mean through baptism. We come to the name of Christ in baptism. If we had an opponent who had any brains in his head, we could discuss this question. It is difficult to debate against predestinated stupidity. He says the lame man at the temple was healed by the name of Jesus without baptism. But he did not receive remission of sins without baptism. Does Dr. Ray think the impartation of strength to the ankle-bones of the lame man was the remission of his sins? Do sins lie in the ankle bones? Miracles were wrought through the name of Christ without baptism, but remission of sins was received through the name of Christ in baptism. This is where he placed it in his plan of salvation. It would gratify us, if our friend would stop his childish quibbling and rise up to the level of one good solid argument. He has not sustained a single point since this discussion began. We are hungry for some debate.

[Baptist Flag.]

The *Christian Messenger* of August 22d has the following:

"The American Baptist Flag abandoned the debate with the MESSENGER without a word of explanation or apology. It did not publish our articles in full, but cut them into scraps, and left nearly one half unpublished and unanswered. This is the way Dr. Ray debates, and he is said to be the champion debater of America. There is not a Baptist editor in the United States that will meet us in debate, and

publish our articles in full. We now tender the proposition upon which Mr. Ray has failed to any Baptist editor that will accept it. What saith Dr. J. R. Graves? "

Several months ago we offered to divide space with the *Messenger*, devoting one column per week to the respective church claims of Baptists and Disciples.

1. Instead of accepting our invitation, the *Messenger*, in order to deceive its readers, commenced publishing, and pretending to review our articles, under a totally different proposition, which did not involve the Campbellites at all.

2. The *Messenger*, instead of occupying with us only one column per week, published enough for three or four columns, about two or three times the space occupied by the Flag.

3. The style of the *Messenger* was so low and depraved that it was not suitable for a religious paper.

4. The pretended arguments of the *Messenger* were so weak and foolish that they were unworthy so much space in a religious paper.

The false accusations of Mr. T. E. Burnett, without even an attempt at proof, were so notoriously untrue and slanderous, that it was not proper to continue their publication in the Flag. For example, Mr. Burnett charged that it was the custom of Baptists to receive members on dreams; and affirmed that a church in Texas received a member on the relation of a dream that he had swallowed a wagon and the tongue lodged in his throat, but when he swallowed the tongue also, he regarded this as evidence that he was converted, and on this dream he was received into a Baptist church. A greater falsehood than this was never hatched up by the devil himself, yet Mr. T. R. Burnett, a pretended Christian preacher and editor, reaffirms this abominable falsehood and slander, affirming it to be the truth! In view of these facts, we do not feel under any obligation to continue the publication of the so-called discussion with such a Christian.

[Christian Messenger.]

In reply to the above false, dirty, slanderous statements of D. B. Ray, we say.

1. We never agreed to discuss his meaningless, intangible proposition called "church claims," but when he challenged us for debate we presented him a specific proposition, embracing the doctrine and practice of the Missionary Baptist church. And Mr. Ray copied this proposition, and went on several weeks trying to defend Baptist doctrine before he discovered that he had not accepted the proposition, and wanted to discuss some-

thing else! And he never made the discovery until he discovered he could not defend Baptist doctrine! We did not deceive the readers of the MESSENGER on this subject, for they were permitted to read every word that passed between D. B. Ray and ourself in regard to the debate. Mr. Ray deceived his readers, for he would not let them see all we wrote. The proposition did not involve the 'Campbellites,' he says. The 'Campbellites' were not concerned in the matter. The MESSENGER is not a 'Campbellite' journal, and cared nothing about their doctrine. We told Mr. Ray that when he surrendered the Baptist doctrine, we would then take the affirmative on a proposition involving the doctrine and practice of the church of Christ.

2. As to the space occupied, we told Mr. Ray that we wished to occupy enough to show that Baptist doctrine and practice was not scriptural, and if he did not have enough space in the Flag to defend the Baptists, we would give him all the space he wanted in the MESSENGER. It was not space that Mr. Ray wanted, but something to put in the space. He was like the little boot-black, that run out of spit! He could not fill one column per week, without repeating himself continually.

3. We never charged that it was the custom of Baptists to receive members on dreams, though they did this sometimes. The account of the swallowing of a wagon was detailed to us by members of the Baptist church. If it is a falsehood and slander hatched by the devil, it was hatched in a Baptist nest, for it came from Baptist mouths. We do not believe the majority of Baptists believe in swallowing wagons or relating dreams, but they do believe in telling experiences, and there is as much scriptural authority for swallowing wagons as for telling experiences. We told Dr. Ray that in the same chapter where he finds that a convert in apostolic days told an experience, we would find that another swallowed a wagon I Why did he not put us to the test?

4. As to the charge that the MESSENGER is low and degraded in debate: How does that sound, coming from the author of the "Text-Book on Campbellism," a book in which G. B. Hand counted six hundred lies, and the authorship of which T. W. Caskey said he would attribute to the devil, if he were not afraid the devil would sue him for slander! D. B. Ray a truth-loving, high-toned debater! Shades of Beelzebub and the three-tailed dragon! A year or two since we had occasion to look into his book—that putrescent sink and store-house of Baptist filth and slander—and we noted more than one falsehood to the page! Mr. Ray ought not to have made that charge against the MESSENGER. His vulgar rantings against the Christians are too

lucent in the columns of this paper for the charge to have any effect upon our readers. They know it is false. Mr. Ray failed to sustain Baptist doctrine, and he had to get out of the debate. The four reasons he assigns for abandoning the discussion should be expressed in one, viz.: I could not defend Baptist doctrine, and I was not honest enough to make a fair surrender, and so I thought fit to slander my opponent! Mr. Ray is like a certain animal we have seen. It can not fight much, but it can raise a fog, and in the fog make its escape. What a letting down it must be to Baptists, to see. their great Goliath, who has been so hungry to devour a few Campbellite editors, surrender the field and take to ignominious flight! Well, his appetite is not as voracious as it used to be!! Until the Baptists can find another Goliath, we shall lay by our sling. Farewell, Bro. Crawford!